

INDEX.

PREFACE.....	1
THE REFORMATION FOR WHICH WE PLEAD—WHAT IS IT ?.....	5
DICK AND SOUTH POINT.....	23
ALLEN WRIGHT.....	29
DO THE UNIMMERSED COMMUNE ?.....	41
THE FIRST BEATITUDE.....	54
HUMAN CREEDS AS TESTS OF TRUTH MAKE VOID THE WORD OF GOD..... J. W. Cox.	60
CRITICISM OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.....	85
THE SYNOPSIS OF THE "NEW INTEREST" IN DETROIT.....	95
REMARKS ON THE PRECEDING.....	100
SHORT ARTICLES FOR PERIODICALS.....	108
NOTE TO THE BROTHERHOOD.....	111
SPIRITUAL INFLUENCE AS IT RELATES TO SINNERS.....	113
MY CHURCH.....	141
DO THE HOLY SCRIPTURES AUTHORIZE INFANT BAPTISM ?.....	155
REPENTANCE..... KAPPA—J. W. McGARVEY.	172
SHALL WE RECOGNIZE OUR FRIENDS IN HEAVEN ?.....	183
A COMMENTARY ON ACTS OF APOSTLES.....	199
REPLY TO AN ARTICLE ENTITLED "DO THE UNIMMERSED COM- MUNE ?..... THETA—THOMAS MUNNELL.	200
MY FIRST MEETING.....	210
THE CAUSE AND THE WORK IT NEEDS.....	223
SPIRITUAL INFLUENCE AS IT RELATES TO CHRISTIANS.....	225
HAVE WE NOT BECOME A SECT ?.....	242
CRITICISM ON THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.....	260
BAPTISM IN ONE SPIRIT INTO ONE BODY.....	271
A REVIEW OF THETA ON COMMUNION..... CULLAN—J. W. Cox.	283
A REVIEW OF THETA'S REPLY ON COM'ION... ALPHA—L. B. WILKES.	300
THE EXPRESSION—JOHN THE BAPTIST..... LAMEDA—C. L. LOOS.	308
HYMNS AND HYMN BOOKS..... KAPPA—J. W. McGARVEY.	319
INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC IN CHURCHES AND DANCING.....	330
THE GIFT OF THE HOLY SPIRIT..... SIGMA—H. CHRISTOPHER.	337
BAPTISM—MEANING OF THE WORD.....	368
THE CHRISTIAN NAME..... OMICRON—JAMES CHALLEN.	383
WILL-WORSHIP..... DISCIPULUS—G. W. LONGAN.	394
THETA'S REPLY TO CULLAN AND ALPHA..... THOMAS MUNNELL.	416
IMMERSION IN THE HOLY SPIRIT..... KAPPA—J. W. McGARVEY.	428
THE BAPTISTS—WHERE ARE THEY GOING ?.....	443
CLOSE OF FIRST VOLUME.....	448

Published by
THE OLD PATHS BOOK CLUB
BOX V
ROSEMEAD, CALIFORNIA
Second Printing, 1952

LARD'S
QUARTERLY.

DEVOTED TO THE
PROPAGATION AND DEFENSE OF THE GOSPEL.

BY MOSES E. LARD.

VOLUME I.

GEORGETOWN, KY
1864.

OSBORNE & CO., PRINTERS, FRANKFORT.

Period
1016
V.1

ANDOVER-HARVARD
THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY
CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

LARD'S QUARTERLY.

VOL. I.

SEPTEMBER, 1863.

No. 1.

PREFACE.

WE this day greet you, brethren, with the first number of the **QUARTERLY**. You expect, and justly no doubt, that this number should be accompanied with some remarks indicative of the ends and objects we have in view.

The question, shall we have a Quarterly? was felt to be far too serious a one to be settled hastily, and by a single mind. Consequently, it has been long under consideration; has been widely submitted to the brotherhood, and has now been pronounced upon by them with the most flattering unanimity. It being at length believed that the question should be affirmatively decided, the present number is the first fruit of that decision. Some of the grounds on which the decision was made may be here stated.

The chief of these certainly was the strong desire felt to increase our facilities as much as possible, for laying before the age in which we live, the claims of *Primitive Christianity*. With us these claims were paramount; hence the desire to give them the widest possible circulation swayed us in our decision, more than every other consideration besides. The highest distinction, then, to which the **QUARTERLY** aspires, is to contain a clear, true statement, and just defense of Christianity as taught in God's holy word. Should it, even in a small degree, prove to be successful in this, its highest aim will have been realized. On its opening page, then, we dedicate it to the uncorrupted Gospel of Christ, and to that noble body of saints who, for the last forty years, have been laboring for its restoration to the world.

Another ground for the decision was the belief that a very general want exists among us as a people, for a larger medium of thought than we yet have. Neither our Monthlies nor our Weeklies can afford the space requisite for those elaborate and completed discussions which the cause of truth at times requires. A due regard to variety often compels these publications to be far too brief in their articles, to treat their subjects serially, and hence in each piece partially. This is often felt to be a source of

General

Net

1-6-58

annoyance to the writer, if not of detriment to the truth, and of mischief to the reader. Against this evil it was felt to be highly necessary to make such provision as a quarterly affords. We as a people certainly need, at this time, the grave medium of a quarterly through which we may, without any hiatus in our articles, give measured expression to our thoughts.

Again, it is an admitted fact, that among us, far too few of our brethren are cultivating themselves as writers. Many of them think soundly, and very many speak well; but, with few exceptions, they are not writing. This, with some, is owing to the fact that they have no eligible and available channel of communication. They are unwilling that their labors shall perish almost in the week in which they appear; hence they are not writing for our weeklies. Neither are they writing for our leading monthly. Indeed, they are simply not writing at all. Through the Quarterly, then, we hope to afford them the opportunity of rendering themselves not less useful as writers than they now are as speakers.

The preceding constitute some of the grounds on which it was decided to publish the Quarterly. In stating them we have also indicated, to some extent, the objects we have in view. We may here further remark, that it is not proposed, as a chief end, to make the Quarterly a literary work. On the contrary, while it will certainly not be wholly indifferent to literary matters, its leading purpose will be, to become eminently a religious journal. It will aim to speak, not merely for the gifted and elite, but for the great heart of mankind. To the sinner it hopes to bear, in earnest manly phrase, a message of truth and mercy; to the Christian one of instruction and comfort.

While the Quarterly will reserve to itself the right to speak without restraint or fear on all those questions which so solemnly involve the interests of humanity, it will yet aim to be no bigot; but in the exercise of a discreet charity, hopes to award to others the amplest room for free thought, and full discussion. Its pages will be at all times open to those who may wish to oppose, as well as to those who may wish to defend, what we conceive to be the truth. It invites a dignified and courteous discussion of all matters upon which Protestants differ—especially of those held by all to be important. Particularly will its pages be open to Baptists and Pseudo-baptists to oppose, where they dissent from us, or to defend, where we dissent from them. They believe us to be seriously, if not fatally, in error. We now tender them space and opportunity to state the grounds of that belief.

Heretofore we as a people have, in the main, contented ourselves with merely stating and defending our own positions, de-

voting but little attention to those of others, except where they stood in the way of the truth. This policy we henceforward change. We expect now to put our opponents to the proof of their tenets. It is one thing to excite a clamor against an adverse party, and quite another thing to construct sufficient proofs of our own cause. Our opponents have shown themselves masters in the former work; we wish them to try their skill in the latter.

The Quarterly will also contain an occasional biographical sketch of some true man, the materials of whose life are identified with the Reformation for which we are pleading. Indeed, in almost every number of the work, we hope to furnish something of the sort. Thereby we may preserve a name from perishing, and do no more than justice to the worth of some noble worker in the great field in which we toil. The history of the mighty work in which we are engaged, is, to some extent, bound up in the history of our public men. Hence, in a record of their names and deeds, we shall often preserve an important historic link.

We shall also, now and then, treat our readers to a narrative of highly important or exciting local incidents; chiefly, however, where they may serve to illustrate the triumphs of truth, or the workings of a mysterious providence. In this way we hope to preserve many incidents and anecdotes far too important to be lost, though in a sense strictly local. To some these themes may seem not altogether suited to the pages of a quarterly. To such we would say, the history of the Reformation we are seeking to effect may one day be written, possibly, by a no very friendly hand. Should such be the case, how many a slander will then rest on some, at the time, forgotten local incident. We consequently wish to preserve as many of these as possible, that we may have in our power, should the time ever come to use them, the means of correction.

The Quarterly will also contain reviews of such books as, appearing from time to time, may demand special notice. These, however, will be confined mostly to such works as bear on the great cause in which we are engaged.

A word to our brethren and we are done. The Quarterly is an experiment. As such, it has claims upon your indulgence and charity. It does not assume to be exempt from defects. Only in its motives does it claim to be free from all ground of charge. Will you, then, be patient, and allow it time to correct those defects; will you be indulgent until it has attained the age at which, with reason, it may be expected to have remedied them? If so, we shall ask no more.

A strong body of able brethren, in the early prime of life, has

been engaged to furnish regular contributions to its pages. Their hearts are in the work. As for the humble name which appears as its editor, he has staked his all upon it. But, brethren, the hungry bird cannot sing; nor is even the humble hen expected to dig without strength. The Quarterly cannot live without your support.

MOSES E. LARD.

THE REFORMATION FOR WHICH WE ARE PLEADING— WHAT IS IT?

WE cannot, perhaps, more appropriately initiate the Quarterly than by an essay on the foregoing question. Some statement, certainly, is demanded, in the outset of our labors, of the objects we, as a people have heretofore been, and are still, aiming at. By this, however, it is not implied that these objects have not been perceived by our brethren, nor that a restatement of them is necessary for their sake. Such implication would be unjust. But that these objects have either not been perceived by large numbers of our cotemporaries, or if perceived by them, that they have been grossly misconstrued, is to us, at least, a well known fact. For their sake, then, but more especially for the sake of those who may candidly desire to know the objects we are aiming at, is the present introductory essay intended.

The object of the Reformation we are endeavoring to effect was not, as seems to have been erroneously thought, and, certainly, falsely said, the formation of a *new sect*. Far, very far from it. Indeed, we formerly believed, and still firmly hold, that the existence of sects and hostile parties in Christendom is one of the sorest curses with which it has been afflicted. Far more truthfully could it be said that a leading object with us was the extinction of all sects. For, while the accomplishment of such an object was, as we well know, a thing to be hoped for only as a bare possibility, unless urged on by tremendous providential causes; yet that it was right to intend such an object as well as to work for it, no enlightened and candid thinker will deny. On the contrary, then, instead of our being actuated even in the smallest degree by the desire to form a new sect, the hope that we might, under God, be enabled, in some measure, to impose a check on this monstrous evil, formed with us a chief incentive to attempt a reformation.

Forty years have now gone since the great chiefs in our ranks became almost simultaneously impressed with the conviction that the state of the so-called religious world then was not the state intended by the founder of Christianity. It is pertinent to the object we here have in view to reconsider briefly that state.

The papacy, (*we now begin to hope its day of retribution is at hand,*) cruel, merciless, and rapacious as in days of old, was growling and thundering its silly anathemas against protestantism. Protestantism, exulting in its young strength, was haughtily retorting every insult, and boldly urging forward its encroachments on the illicit gettings of Rome. The wrath of the parties, hot as in the days of the Inquisition, only bitted decidedly on the one side, showed

clearly that it was destined never to cool. Amidst this fierce commotion, half political, half religious, but in no sense Christian, the true gospel and spirit of Christ were completely lost sight of. The Papacy, as such, was the "man of sin" of the Scriptures. Protestantism, as such, was not Christianity. Right it may have been in many respects, as it certainly was; but Christian, in any respect, necessarily, it certainly was not. With this state of things, no man knowing the truth, and at heart desirous of it, and of communion with Christ, could get his consent to remain satisfied. A better state of things was clearly demanded.

Nor was confusion and estrangement of heart confined to these parties alone. Even amongst Protestants party spirit flamed high with no signs of subsidence. Calvinism, cold, narrow, bigoted Calvinism, claimed to be the only orthodox faith in the world, and hence demanded universal credence. Arminianism put forth the adverse claim, and refused to accept an inferior homage to that demanded by its great rival. Here, too, the strife was fierce and seemed nothing short of endless. Out of these huge strifes sects and parties rapidly arose. Each reared high its narrow standard, proclaimed itself divine, and published its "*lo here*," as the sure specific for all ecclesiastic ills. Amongst Presbyterians we had "*old sides*" and "*new sides*," Seceders and Dissenters, with numerous smaller sects, each imbued with a genuine Ishmalitish animosity against its cognate sect. Amongst the Methodists sects were bred with a fecundity perfectly amazing. Each succeeding throe gave us a succeeding sect, each a little less, and a little worse than the parent source. The Baptists, by perceptible and steady disintegrations, were fast resolving themselves down into little flocks with little light, little life, and a hopeless future. These sects, in regard to all that is most amiable amongst sects, constituted the fairest samples of the age. Can even the most partial eye recognize in them the state of things for which Christ prayed when he requested that *all his followers might be one*? With a few things that were good amongst these sects, they still held much that was positively bad. They existed as sects, and as such, were in a great measure powerless for good. They hated each other cordially, one never causing another even an emotion of joy, except when some straggling sheep bounded away from his own fold and came abroad seeking shelter elsewhere. True, these sects held some practices that are worthy of high praise. We greatly admire the strictness with which Presbyterians rear their children. Our only grief being that they teach them, not the life-inspiring and quickening truths of the Gospel, but the cold dicta of that *caput mortuum*, the catechism. The zeal of Methodists is certainly worthy of a better cause. We duly honor the man who is not

ashamed to enter the humblest African cabin to bear to its inmates what he deems a message of life and deliverance. We highly commend the simple unostentatious worship of Baptists, particularly the older type of them, and sincerely admire their earnest trusting faith in God. These traits we deem worthy of something more than admiration; we even deem them worthy of imitation. Still, it was felt that, as long as these parties existed as sects, the redemption of the world could never be achieved through them. Hence it was felt that a grand necessity had arisen for supplanting them by something immeasurably better, to-wit: The "*one body*" of Christ.

Scholastic theology had, at the time of which we are speaking, completely engrossed the minds of the clergy. Indeed, this had been the case for long ages before. The language employed by these men in their writings and sermons was a peculiar language. Their themes were recondite and metaphysical. The essential natures of the Father and the Son, the mystic mode of three in one and one in three, predestination, foreknowledge, free will, how a spirit divine quickens a spirit human—these were the popular themes of the clergy. Yet in time these themes became the themes of the people, and constituted the body of their faith. That peculiar language was on every lip. Holy trinity, triune God, God the Son, God the Holy Ghost, eternal sonship, eternally begotten, eternally proceeding from the Father, Holy Ghost religion, heart religion, head religion, sanctifying grace, electing grace, particular atonement, general atonement, general atonement and particular application, operation of the Holy Ghost, getting religion, etc. These are a specimen of that peculiar dialect which, while it may have served to impress an audience with the depth of him that used it, never failed to leave them in a mood shallow, doubtful, and painfully unsatisfactory. These clergy talked of a special call to the ministry with as much face as if it had been a commendable thing to lie. They boldly affirmed their rank and qualifications to be of God; and pronounced their neighbors heretics, who dissented from them, with as little scruple as if they had been unfallen seraphs. These assumptions gave them great power over the common people. Their decisions in matters of religion rated but little below a revelation. Such was their influence over the masses that the right of private judgment was virtually abandoned. They felt that to look after the interests of the soul was as peculiarly their prerogative, as it was that of Aaron and his sons to guard the ancient Ark of the Covenant. The interpretation of the Holy Scriptures was their inalienable right. Hence the common people left them unread, and consulted their clergy to learn their duty, much as they did their physician in questions of gout. Few will say that a change was not demanded here.

Tradition had accumulated upon the Bible, until its brightest pages emitted but a small dubious light; its broad truths and fine distinctions were shrouded in obscurity; its plainest precepts were set aside to make room for the "commandments of men;" while, by many, it was even dishonored as a "dead letter." Its authority was little more than nominal, its decisions little better than prudent counsel. Hence, like a thing of no account, it lay unread, unstudied, with the dust of ages upon its sacred lids. True, much of this neglect is due to the fact that but few knew how to read it; and even the few who did, scarcely dared to exercise a right which might so soon subject them to the charge of having imbibed some dangerous heresy. No book will ever be much read or much cherished which is not understood; and forty years ago, as now, he who took his faith from the Bible was treated as a heretic, while he who collated his creed from other sources was held as orthodox. In nothing did the religious world more need a reformation, at the time, than in the method then current of studying the Holy Scriptures. Perhaps we should rather say, the religious world then needed a method; for, with the common people, at least, there was none. The Scriptures were regarded much in the light of a book on curious arts, and were read as though replete with mystic double meanings. Planless they certainly were to the masses; and where they meant any thing at all, they meant one thing about as well as another. Did a man wish to know what to do to be saved; he was as likely to read the Proverbs of Solomon as the Acts of Apostles. Things said to Moses as prophet, or to Aaron as priest, were held as equally applicable to the sinner for the first time seeking the way of life. The consequence was, that every conceivable doctrine was held; for every conceivable doctrine could be proved. Contradiction and confusion held a high hand over most minds; and, as for relief, men seem to have thought of none. We have a distinct recollection of listening, for near twenty years, to the preaching of the day; and, during that entire period, we heard not even one discourse calculated to teach the people how to study the Holy Scriptures. Indeed, where neither preacher nor people knew their value, it is not strange that they gave themselves but little trouble to understand them. Still the preachers needed the Bible, because it furnished them their "texts;" and the people needed it, because it proved predestination and free will. Beyond this its value amounted to nothing. The mode of expounding it in those days was a curious one. Expound was a compound word, composed of *ex* and *pound*. Pound meant to beat or strike, *ex* meant out of. Hence to expound the Bible meant an effort to pound its meaning out with a huge fist; which generally resulted, not really in pounding any

meaning out of the Bible, but in pounding its meaning all out of the heads of the people. It had a literal, figurative and spiritual meaning. Its literal meaning was for the rabble, its figurative for the just awakened, its spiritual for the quickened elect. When explained at all it was firstly, secondly, and thirdly, in harmony with its three-fold meaning, but seldom or never rationally or correctly.

Creeds and confessions of faith had accumulated to such an extent that libraries groaned beneath their weight, and heads were turned by their contents. Though intended originally, it may be, to compose disputes, they served rather to fan the flame of religious discord; and instead of uniting the friends of Christ in fraternal affection, they estranged the children of God one from another, and reared between them doctrinal and practical barriers insuperable to pious and conscientious men. Designed at first, possibly, to exclude only error, they came in the lapse of time to exclude only the truth. Instead of being repositories for the mind and spirit of Christ, they teemed with the effete matter of bold dreamers, or the crude dogmas of arrant speculators. To the pragmatic, they were cyclopedias of doctrines and philosophies for criticism, digest, and the display of empiricism. To the humble Christian, they were learned little tomes, with much darkness, little light, and no adaptation to the common mind and common heart of the people. Whatever defense may be made for creeds, and to enlightened reason there is none, they are an impeachment of the Word of God as a sufficient rule of faith and practice. They are a virtual declaration, either that Christ would not provide such a rule for his people, or that he has not done it. In the former case, they impeach Him, in the latter case, they impeach His word; and in either case, they are a disgrace alike to those that make them and to those that accept them.

Superstition, or an error closely akin to it, swayed, if not all minds, certainly the popular mind to an almost unexampled extent. The people had become persuaded that religion was a thing "to be got," and a thing "to be lost," like a dinner or a sock—a thing inexplicable before the getting—a thing inexplicable after. Some were "seekers," some "mourners," some had "a hope," others merely "thought" they had; some had "faith," others doubted if theirs was "the right kind," some were "exercised," some "anxious," some "concerned," some were barely "converted," some "hopefully" converted, some "powerfully" converted; one had a "bright manifestation," another had a "bright experience," and so the matter ran. Often, in the operation, vulgarly called "getting through," the sinner was suddenly transported from the deepest mental gloom, or keenest

spiritual agony, into a sort of half clairvoyant state—a state in which “sights” were seen and “voices” heard incommunicable to unregenerate ears. These were mysterious warnings to the guilty soul, or the gentle whisperings of the angel of peace assuring the freed spirit of its acceptance on high. Marvelous dreams were often dreamt, and taken as an evidence of “a work of grace in the soul;” when all they proved was a work of meat in the stomach, for a huge supper yet lay undigested there. These sights and dreams, and exercises, constituted what was then, and still is, familiarly known as “experimental religion.” However sincere men might be in their efforts to “get religion,” and it is pleasing to know that they were really so, still they had no certain guarantee that in the end they should be successful. The future was all doubtful. Nor was it confidently known in many cases that success had been achieved at all. For even the brightest experiences cast some shadows of doubt. Each instance of success was a palpable miracle, so felt, and so held, in the heart of the convert, and so accepted by others; and yet the most intelligent and virtuous generally doubted, the most abandoned, seldom.

Such, to a great extent, was the state of the religious world forty years ago; and, although in certain localities important changes have been effected, such, in the main, is still its state. It is due the truth of private personal history to say that a few men of the times saw these evils and grieved over them; but being either unable to comprehend their nature, or to discover a remedy for them, or if able to discover it, afraid to apply it, they effected simply nothing in the way of a cure. What was to be done? That some great, and serious reformation was demanded, was evident.

But what was to be the character of that reformation? In other words, in what, 1st, was it to take its rise? In what, 2d, was it to consist? To what final end, 3d, was it to look? These were grave questions. On the judicious settlement of them every thing depended. One false step here and it was felt that all might be lost. For the present we shall merely indicate briefly the answers to these questions. A fuller discussion of them will then follow.

In reply to the first question it was decided, *that the reformation demanded must take its rise in the expressed will of Christ*. This will is now the supreme law of both doctrine and practice; and all reformations have reference to one or the other, or both, of these. Hence in this will must the present reformation have its rise. It must accept this as its supreme regulating principle.

The reply to the second question was easy; the reformation was to be both *doctrinal* and *practical*. It was to consist in holding pre-

cisely and only what is taught in the word of God, and in founding our practice strictly thereon.

In answer to the third question it was determined, that the final end to which the reformation should look is a complete return to primitive Christianity, in doctrine, in practice, and in spirit. All of which is concisely expressed in the following decision: To believe precisely what the Scriptures teach, to practice only what they enjoin, and to reject every thing else. Hence the reformation proposed was to be marked, positively, by accepting, as matter of faith, what, and only what, the holy Scriptures teach; practically, by doing every thing and only what they enjoin, and, negatively, by rejecting every thing which they do not sanction. Such was the reformation proposed by Mr. Campbell and his brethren. But we must now enlarge a little.

All reformations have their origin in some theoretic question or questions. Nor are they, as a general rule, less distinguished by their theoretic, than by their practical, peculiarities. At least is this true of all reformations of any great note. Such was the case with the reformation of the sixteenth century. It took its rise in the question of *justification*, strictly a theoretic question; the controversy being whether, with Rome, a man is justified by works, or, with Luther, he is justified by faith alone. This question underlay all the labors of the great German. Nor can less be said of the reformation for which we are pleading. Every leading feature of it has its basis in some important theoretic question. True, it may be said that reformations have their origin in the perversions or corruptions of Christianity. But this is not strictly correct. Corruptions may be the *occasion* of a reformation; but in them it cannot arise. It must, if it be genuine, have its origin in the will of Christ, or in our view of it, and be corrective of corruptions. It must contain some strong positive element, and not be merely relative or negative. That element is the determining will of Christ. It so happens that in a reformation, such as we are speaking of, errors are corrected, and hence it is relative. But this is not the only feature it contains. It is constructive, as well as destructive; that is, it is designed to build up the cause of Christ as well as to correct error.

But we are proceeding too rapidly. What do we mean by the word theory? Without a correct answer to this question, we shall be constantly encountering a deep-grown prejudice in the popular mind. For there, every thing assumed to be theoretic in religion is strongly objected to. It matters nothing, is the common saying on both learned and unlearned lips, what a man's theory is provided only his practice is right. To this position, so false yet so current, we shall reply more particularly further on. The word

theory is derived from the Greek, and literally means seeing. But seeing in the common acceptation of the term is not the popular meaning of theory. Seeing with the organ of vision is one thing; theoretic seeing another. The word theory denotes, not seeing with the eye, but seeing with the mind. It denotes the mental view we take of a thing. In the present essay we mean by it the view we take of what the Holy Scriptures teach. They contain a revelation of the mind or the will of God to man. The word, theory expresses the view we take of that mind or will. It is perhaps proper to remark here in order to prevent misapprehension, that the word theory is frequently, perhaps we might even say generally, used to express a pure speculation. Something which has no foundation except in the mind. In this acceptation we do not here use it. With us the word theory expresses something actually existant, a positive reality; and consequently something which exists, not only in the mind, but out of it, but which exists as a theory only with reference to the mind. The word expresses not only the act of mind-seeing but especially *what* is thus seen.

Now it so happens that every theory is marked by one or more of four characteristics. It is either *partial* or *complete*, *exact* or *inexact*.

A theory is partial when it takes in a part only of the contents of God's word; when it is a view not of the whole of these, but of a part only. Such are all the theories of men. They comprehend, not all, but only a part of "the things of God." Such in some measure must they continue to be as long as man sees through a glass darkly.

A theory is complete when it includes the entire contents of the word of God. Completeness means fullness, and in the present case, has reference not merely to extent of view, but to number, in respect to particulars. A theory is therefore complete when it includes all the particulars contained in the Holy Scriptures. In his present state, no man can claim for his theory that it is complete in this sense, that it contains all the sacred volume contains, that of all the particulars of that wonderful book it omits not one. But may it not be his proud lot one day, in the distant and enchanting future, to number them all in his theory? We love to cherish such dreams.

A theory is exact when, throughout its whole extent, it corresponds precisely to the Divine original. In order to exactness, it is not necessary that a theory shall be complete; that is, contain all the particulars of the Divine volume. It is only necessary that, as far as it does contain them, they, as constituting the view, shall correspond truly to the things viewed.

A theory is inexact when this correspondence does not exist, but is merely assumed to exist. Here, more than in anything else, is error likely to appear in theories. They are assumed to contain the things of God (*τα του Θεου*) when such is not the case.

Now what is required in every theory is, not that it shall be complete, though the nearer it approaches this the better certainly, but that *it shall be exact*. This much cannot be dispensed with. Indeed, it is difficult to see how even God could accept less. That the view we take of His holy word, whatever may be its extent, should correspond truly to that word, is absolutely necessary. Anything short of this would be unjust to the truth.

But when we say that the view we take of God's word should be just to it, that is, correspond truly to it, we may be misunderstood. We do not mean that a mere resemblance shall exist between the elements or particulars of our theory and the contents of His word; but that these contents shall themselves constitute those elements or particulars. This is what we mean. The contents of that word must reappear in our theory, and compose it; otherwise it is false—it is no theory at all, but a mere vacant gaze of the mind. Still by some it may be said that whether the contents of the word of God, and the particulars of our theory are identical, or merely resemble each other, is not worth discussing. We do not propose to discuss the question; we merely state the case, together with our own conviction, and there leave the matter. But let no one suppose the case as stated by us an impossible one. The contents of the word of God are its meaning. This meaning is perceived by the mind; and not only is it *the* thing perceived by the mind—it is the only thing perceived by it. This meaning thus perceived and held in the mind is the Christian's theory. It is the word of God, the truth dwelling within him, the *lumen* of the soul, or light of the spiritual eye.

What in the light of these premises would constitute a perfect theory? A perfect theory would be both *complete* and *exact*. In regard to the former characteristic, the most that can be affirmed of any theory, is that it is a mere approximation; in respect to the latter, none should be defective. The very least that can be required of any theory, is that it shall be exact. Nor is this a mere speculative requisition. Certainly the word of God has a meaning, determinate, that may be known by the mind, and what may be known in this case, is positively required to be known. To doubt that the word of God has a meaning is monstrous; to deny either that it may be known, or is to be known, is no better. Whether a theory is, or is not, in fact, exact, is another question. What we affirm is, not merely that a theory may be, but that it

dogmatically must be exact. To a thinker this position is all but self-evident.

Not only, moreover, is a distinct knowledge of the truth attainable; but we hold that we may even know that we know the truth, not certainly in all cases, but in every case seriously affecting the interests of the soul. We are not only conscious, in many instances, that we know a thing; but conscious that we know it correctly, truly, as it was intended to be known. We are, in other words, as conscious that we know the thing *as it was designed to be known*, as we are that we know it at all. This is the best and highest knowledge. To know that we know, is the proof that we know; and in the proof that we know, lies the pleasure of knowing. That things which are equal to the same third are equal to one another, is not merely a truth, it is a truth for the mind. It may be apprehended in thought as a truth, and in the act the mind is conscious that it so apprehends it. The same, to a certain extent, is true in Christianity. Indeed, if this were not so, it would be difficult to see on what ground man is to be held accountable. For, if he may know the truth, and yet not know that he knows it, this is the same thing as if he did not know it at all. In this case, it would be hard to hold him accountable for a course of action in conformity to the truth. The Bible, then, being assumed true, we hold that its contents may be so apprehended that the mind has in the act, the highest possible assurance that its knowledge is correct. Indeed, that this is so, and that the mind does know the truth, it not only refuses to doubt, but finds it impossible to doubt. It reposes with unquestioning faith on this knowledge. It is the truth thus known that makes us free, and fills the heart with joys so exquisitely pleasurable, that renders the life of the enlightened Christian the pure foretaste of the life to come. In no one thing perhaps, so far as happiness in this life is concerned, does true religion more advantageously contrast itself with false, than in this. The advocates of the latter spend their lives in doubt, the only thing of which they are positively certain being that they doubt. These doubts enter largely into their experiences, especially into the popular tenet of experimental religion, in which they are a chief element. Indeed, the entire body of the tenet may be said to consist of these doubts, and in a certain excited state of feelings.

In every attempt, therefore, to effect a reformation, the very first thing to be done is the formation of a theory approaching completeness as near as can be, and in all its particulars exact. In this event two important questions will be at once settled. 1st, What is to be accepted as doctrine? 2d, What is to be rejected, as not doctrine? By these questions the mind is brought at once

immediately into contact with the word of God, as the source from which the theory is to be formed. Here will arise the investigation and discussion of doctrinal or theoretic questions. But 1st, how shall these investigations be conducted so as to result successfully? And 2d, what is their effect upon the minds of those that conduct them?

1st. We reply, that the investigations shall be conducted in conformity to such laws of exegesis *as necessarily elicit the truth*. To say that they shall be conducted in accordance with such laws as *may elicit the truth*, is merely to say that the results may or may not be true. Of course no truth is thus elicited, except by accident; and then it is not known to be a truth, but only a problematic proposition. Such investigations may start questions for debate, but they settle nothing; they furnish the mind with no truth, but leave it still in search of truth. Such are most of the investigations now current amongst the sects; and such the main body of the rules by which they are conducted. The consequence is, that the conclusions arrived at are mere propositions yet to be proved true. More especially is this true of those conclusions which are accepted as the basis of partyism, or which constitute the doctrinal or theoretic differences between one sect and another. Of even the very best of them, the most that can possibly be said is that they *may* be true; of not one can it be said *it is true*. In no one thing known to us, could a competent person at this time more certainly prove himself the benefactor of the world, than by producing a sound, and masterly work on sacred criticism. Should such a work ever be produced, whatever may be its character in other respects, of one thing we feel assured, that its laws and rules must be the embodiment of necessary and intuitive truths—of such, consequently, as compel their own belief; not such as *may be* admitted or accepted, but such as cannot be rejected or denied. Such a work, and we believe it to be perfectly practicable, would be worth all the commentaries ever written on the Bible.

But in regard to laws of exegesis, and the formation of a correct theory, let us be understood. We do not mean that the human mind can, either by intuition, or the aid of these laws, invent a perfect theory, or thereby determine what truths are Divine, and what not. This is not the province of such means of knowledge. To determine what is to be accepted as of God, and what not, belongs to a different branch of investigation. The question of revelation is a question of fact, and to be determined like any other question of fact. What we mean is, that this question of fact being settled, and revelation being granted, we may know the contents thereof, and feel perfectly assured that we know

them correctly. In other words, we mean that there are laws of exegesis which may, by intuition, be perceived to be necessary laws of thought; and that by these the meaning of Holy Writ may be determined, not doubtfully, but with absolute certainty. We may be very incapable of inventing a proposition; but that we may certainly know its meaning is a demonstrable fact. Thus, we may not only know its meaning, but be rendered profoundly certain that we do know it. If for example, we construct, and give expression to a proposition, it is demonstrated that we are understood, provided the person hearing us returns our identical meaning in some equivalent form of expression. Surely this is an every day occurrence; and one, too, which establishes the fact that there are laws of thought which unerringly guide the mind to the meaning of verbal communications. If I say, the pen with which I write is made of the quill of a goose, my meaning is instantly, and certainly collected. The mind cannot but see it. Now why? In the answer to this question, we have one of those necessary laws which so unerringly lead to the meaning of Holy Writ. To enunciate this law is not here my purpose, I wish merely to indicate its certain existence. These laws I call necessary, because in all cases they discover the true meaning, and cannot but discover it. If there be any cases in which they cannot be applied of course they are not here taken into the account. What these laws are more particularly, it will be the business of some future number of this work to inquire. Of them certainly must a work consist, should one ever be produced, which shall be final on the question of sacred criticism.

I am now prepared to reply more fully to the popular position that it matters nothing what a man's theory is, provided only his practice is right. This position would unquestionably be correct, if it ever happened that a man's practice is right, while his theory is wrong. But this is not the case. The position assumes it, I know; but in this lies its error. It is a man's theory that determines his practice. What a word is to an idea, practice is to theory; the one is the expression, or embodiment of the other. Especially is this true in cases where our practice is regulated by the will of another, as in Christianity. Here the other's will creates the practice, and hence, of course, determines it. Where conduct results from the expression of authority, or is influenced by will, it is as certainly shaped by theory, or mental view, as is the position of a shadow determined by the direction in which the light falls upon the body which casts it. Differences in practice are determined and accounted for in the same way. Why, to use a few familiar illustrations, does the practice of one physician differ from that of another? It is evidently owing to a difference in

their respective theories. The practice of one farmer differs from that of another, and why? Because one takes one view of his calling, the other takes a different view. Why, further, do the usages and practices of one denomination differ so widely from those of another? Clearly because each is under the influence of a different theory. We conclude, then, that it is not true that it matters nothing what a man's theory is, provided only his practice is right. The position assumes what is false, and hence should be rejected.

Since, moreover, it is a man's theory which determines his practice, it follows that if his theory be defective, his practice must be so too. His practice will never rise above his theory. Hence, if his practice approach his theory perfectly, allowing the latter to be defective, and only in case of defective theory can practice approach it perfectly, then is he at fault in two respects—theory and practice, when he should be at fault only in one—practice. In this case, further practice cannot be improved beyond a certain limit. When it approaches theory completely, improvement ceases. Yet in this life it is never contemplated that practice will become so perfect that improvement must cease. On the contrary, then, we hold the true position to be—*a theory strictly correct, and a practice as nearly conformed to it as possible*. In this case practice may be always improving, always approaching its perfect standard, but, in this life, never completely attaining it.

But what is the effect of theoretic discussions upon the minds of those that conduct them? It is, of course, much the same as that of any other purely intellectual exercise. They tend to sharpen the intellectual powers, to render them more acute and penetrating, and hence serve as an excellent mental discipline. They lead us, in the first place, to examine our conceptions with the greatest possible minuteness, to exclude from them all elements which do not properly belong to them, to give distinctness and individuality to those which do. By them we are introduced into the very secret chambers of thought, and are compelled to the narrowest inspection of every element upon which the mind works. They induce definiteness, clearness, and fullness in our ideas. They render us, in a word, familiar with the very first, and most important elements of religious inquiry. In the second place, they lead us to an accurate, and comprehensive study of the meaning of words. In no department of human thought is thorough discipline more necessary. How it is in other minds we know not, but in the human, thought exists only in connection with its symbols or terms. In these alone it finds a translation from mind to mind. Nor is this true of human minds only. For, as yet, our Heavenly Father has indicated no medium through

which he holds intelligible intercourse with us, except words. How otherwise he may impress or act upon us is not here the question. Intercourse involving thought, communicating intelligence, expressing will, he certainly has none with us, except through the medium of words. By these alone we learn the relations we sustain to him, the multiform duties we owe to him, and the sublime end which awaits us if true to him. In these he has embodied his mind and all his purposes concerning us. How important, then, that the mind should be profoundly skilled in the use of terms, and in the best and surest methods of ascertaining their exact import. Nothing tends more directly and certainly to create and foster this skill than theoretic discussions; hence their value. Such discussions tend, moreover, to cultivate and develop especially the logical faculty. They lead us to study intimately the structure and meaning of propositions, the nature of premises, the relation between them and conclusions—in a word every thing constituting the validity of arguments or in any way vitiating them. They serve, furthermore, to make us acquainted with the laws of evidence, the force and relevancy of testimony, the nature of proof, together with the various and proper methods and rules of refutation and disproof. Such is the tendency and effect of theoretic discussions. Those who engage in them are apt to become acute and accurate verbal critics, masters of logic, and skillful disputants. Of the truth of what is here said, our own brethren afford a striking exemplification. In no denomination in Christendom, we venture to think, of the same numerical strength, can an equal number of discriminating critics, accomplished logicians, and skillful debaters be found. Indeed, so obviously and necessarily do theoretic discussions tend to cultivate, refine, and sharpen the intellectual powers; and so brilliantly and successfully are these powers displayed when encountering opposition, that those who take part in such discussions are frequently accused of believing in and having only *a religion of the head*. So often has this charge been repeated against our brethren that it has now become a stale and harmless thing. But have those who have repeated it ever bestowed upon it a single serious thought? Have they ever asked why it is, or how it is? We suspect not. The charge has never cost us the least trouble. We know that theoretic discussions and investigations are absolutely necessary in order to eliminate and defend the correct theory of Christianity, we see their tendency and approve it; and, further, feel that a high law of necessity is guiding us in this matter. Neither these discussions, nor the intellectual refining to which they lead, would have been necessary, had the religion of Christ been suffered to remain pure as it came

from His hands. But it has been grossly and extensively corrupted, and its light eclipsed. Hence has arisen the necessity for the use of those means which alone can recover it from its degradation.

But while engaged in the discussion of purely theoretic questions, there will seem to arise a dangerous neglect of practical matters. Accordingly, our brethren have been accused, not only of holding to a religion merely of the head, but also of serious delinquencies in matters of duty. But has the accusation been well founded? and has not the neglect existed more in the seeming than in the reality? We believe it has; and yet we do not claim to have been faultless in practice. An apparent excess in one direction may seem to indicate a deficiency in another; when the deficiency is not absolute, but only relative. It was the high theoretic ground assumed by our brethren that caused their practice to appear unduly defective; when in reality it was not more so, *per se*, than was in charity to have been expected. We grant, however, a serious discrepancy between our theory and our practice; but yet insist that this is owing to what our theory is, not to what our practice is not. Our practice is not worse than that of other people: *our theory is better*. Still, our position we maintain to be right. But let us be understood. We do not mean that it is right for practice to differ from theory, when theory is exact; and yet we know that the case will never in this life be otherwise. We mean that since the case is thus, it is better that the defect shall exist in the practice than in the theory. If the theory be exact, the practice may always be growing better, its defects may be indefinitely corrected; but if the theory be inexact, the case is hopeless.

But again, it is in the very attempt to form an exact theory, that defects in practice become apparent; and in such a theory only have we any sure pledge of their correction. In sharp theoretic discussions of wide range, a large amount of light will necessarily be elicited. In the blaze of this light defects in practice are at once seen. This course will be persevered in, discussion will go on, light will increase, until these defects become so glaring that an imperious necessity demands their correction. But now we are in the precise condition to enter upon the work of correction. By the aid of this very light is the work to be commenced. We now not only see what needs correction, but we are furnished with the very best means of effecting it.

At this juncture a crisis will always arise in the history of every reformation founded in correct principles. Such has been the case in our own. Theoretic defects may be corrected in a day, but not so practical ones. Obstinate habits of wrongdoing are corrected

only by degrees and after a long time. Hence some men, who seem not aware of this, on turning their attention to practical defects, and making an effort to correct them, and finding that they do not at once succeed, despair of success. They now sit down in a complaining mood. Theory is blamed for these defects. Too much attention, it is now urged, has been bestowed on purely theoretic questions; while practical matters have been allowed to languish. But this complaint is not just. Theory, unless it be a faulty one, is not to blame for these defects. They had their existence before any question respecting theory was started; and it was precisely with a view to correcting them that such question was started. On the contrary, instead of being to blame for these defects, theory has only revealed the fact of their existence; and now, not only demands their immediate correction, but supplies the laws in obedience to which it must be effected.

To indicate our meaning still more fully and specifically, let any one take up the *Christian Baptist*. He will find that it literally teems with theoretic discussions; and if he does not find it the most complete, he will certainly find it the most luminous of Mr. Campbell's writings. Indeed, the period of the *Christian Baptist* was the inceptive, theoretic period of the reformation. Our theory, as it relates to ourselves, was then in its incipient formative state. We do not mean of course that its matter was then formed, but only that this matter then first begun to be formed in us into a theory. This theory then began to assume exactness, and from that time on it has been steadily growing more and more complete. May its progress in this direction never be checked! But what constitutes the body of our more recent periodical literature? With emphasis it may be said, the discussion of practical questions. The duties of evangelists and the limit of their power, the duty of elders, the duty of deacons, the duties of private members, forms of church organization, modes of trying offenders, modes of excluding them, missions and missionary societies, educational schemes, plans of finance—these are some of the themes with which our periodicals of the present day are filled. This is precisely as it should be. Having advanced sufficiently far in theoretic matters to justify it, we are now engaged in an effort to correct our practical defects. But this is a slow work, and requires patience. Let no brother despair because he brings not practice up to a perfect standard in a day. Nay, rather, let us work steadily for the worthy end, work with heart, trusting in God, and great results must at last be achieved. Let us remember that there is a philosophy and a law in every reformation founded in truth. These we are not to seek to modify, but to them labor to conform. We must first have our theory, then our practice. Heretofore our labor has been in the former, at present it is

in the latter. Have we seen all this at all times? Or has not a sublime providence been governing us, whose leadings we have not understood? Have we been elaborating a grand theory by chance, or did we by the mind's own light forecast the degree of perfection it has now attained, and the exact date when our attention, as that of a single man, should be turned to errors in practice? We may have known what we were doing, but we have surely not always known why. The hand of God is in the work.

But just here in our history some will fall away. We have now entered the period when, by the light of our theory, we are attempting to effect a corresponding reformation in practice. A few impatient and unphilosophic spirits, seeing that the work goes slowly forward, will falter and turn back. By their clamor and their fruits you shall know them. They will cry down the theoretic in religion, and extol the practical. Indeed, they are now prepared to ignore theory altogether. Hence they are ready to fraternize with Episcopalians, Methodists, Presbyterians, Baptists, Universalists—in a word, with any sect or party, provided only an agreement can be effected in a few small practical details. This, of course, is easily done; and then the circle is completed. Starting in the darkness of sectarianism, these men halted in the light of Christianity; and now starting in the light of Christianity, they have ended in the darkness of sectarianism. They may be readily known by their abnormal charity and eccentric affinities. They love every body but their brethren, forget no one except their former friends, and have an intense affinity for sects, but none for the Church of Christ. They talk much of spiritual Christianity, but attempt to check their folly, and they reveal that they have the spirit of the Devil. At the mention of baptism, they sneer; at the mention of baptism and repentance, they are shocked; at the mention of baptism for remission of sins, they take hysterics: while at the mention of the reformation, they positively have spasms. They love the sects, and yet will not abandon the brethren whom they hate, preach in churches where they are not wanted, affect piety as mechanically as a pharisee, and speak of the blunders of Mr. Campbell with an air exquisitely ludicrous. Such are a few of those who, just at this time, must slough off into the service of Satan.

But, we repeat, we have now arrived at the period in our history when a reformation in practice is urgently demanded. To this work it now becomes us to address ourselves with a strong will, and prayerful heart. What is merely respectable is not enough. We should, in our conduct as a people, exhibit a sublime moral spectacle to the world. Our faith should be clear and strong; our piety deep and pure; our love intense and large; our devotion to God cordial and uniform, and our practice a simple and

faultless conformity to the will of Christ. But even here we encounter a danger which we must not omit to point out. It is possible that our attention to practical matters, important though they are, may become dangerously exclusive. We may bestow on them an attention, not too constant, but certainly too partial. Let this be done, and let our view of the mind, or will of Christ become dim or untrustworthy, and we at once lose the power to proceed with our practical reform. Hence, while steadily prosecuting our work in this respect, we must by no means neglect constant efforts to render our theory still further complete, and yet more exact. The task with many is not easy; for but few persons can attend, with equal success, to two different duties at the same time. Still the importance of the duties renders the task imperative. This will lead to the laborious and minute study of the Holy Scriptures, since it is from them that our theory is to be formed. Caution, discrimination, and a sound judgment will give exactness, patience and perseverance, completeness.

We are now prepared to answer more definitely and fully the question standing at the head of this article. The reformation for which we are pleading consists, 1st. *In accepting the exact meaning of Holy Writ as our religious theory.* This is held as the doctrine of the Holy Scriptures, the thing taught in them, and hence the thing to be believed, or the matter of faith. Hence, human elements are absolutely excluded from our theory. Reason may determine what is said in God's word, not what *ought* to be said. We accept as our creed the contents of his word without enlargement, contraction, or modification. Such is the matter of our theory.

2d. *In the minute conformity of our practice to the revealed will of Christ.* Such is the second feature of the reformation. Hence all practices having their origin in tradition, human reason, or expediency, are utterly eschewed. In other words, the reformation consists in an effort to induce all the truly pious in Christ to become perfectly joined together in the same mind, and in the same judgment, by accepting as doctrine, precisely and only what is either actually asserted or necessarily implied in the Bible; to speak the same things by speaking what the Bible speaks, and to speak them in the language of the Bible; and to practice the same things by doing simply the will of Christ. Thus it is proposed continually to construct the body of Christ after the Divine model, to unitize completely its constituent members, to imbue them with a new, divine life, and to pervade them with the "peace" of Christ, and a warm, pure, fraternal affection. Such is the great and good work in which we are now engaged. That it should ever have been opposed or spoken against by a single being possessed of mind enough to comprehend it, is certainly one of the mysteries of sin.

DICK AND SOUTH POINT.

In the summer of 1853 I had an appointment to preach in Richfield, Missouri. The Sunday morning at length came, and I rode down to the village. While hitching my horse a black man came up to me and said: "You do not know me; but I know you, and have known you for a long time. My name is Dick; I once belonged to the Church at Stanley's, where old brother Warrinner used to preach; and near which he is buried. Since his death the church has gone to pieces; and I have been long without its privileges. I have come fifteen miles to-day to hear you preach, and have brought with me my young master, Thomas. He is a good boy; and I think would be a Christian if he knew how."

With this artless tale of a poor servant man, my heart was touched. My memory at once became fragrant with reminiscences of the past. The strange, sweet eloquence of Jacob Warrinner warbled once more through my soul; and I felt the spell of that dear man. He had been my friend; and I loved him still. When a young man, and trying to preach, I had sometimes blundered. Others had criticised me coarsely; but Jacob Warrinner patted me on the shoulder, looked me warmly in the eye, and said: "Go on, my son, you have done well. Be thoughtful and persevere; and when I am gone you will be a man." These were precious words; and dear to me still were the lips that had spoken them. My preaching brother, perhaps you have many years and much experience on your side. Your counsel is weighty. Then lay your hand gently on that young brother whose devoted, anxious heart prompts him to preach. Again, I say, criticise him gently. If God stooped to make him, he may not be worthless. An encouraging word will cost you nothing. Risk a few, then, on that young man. You may one day be glad you did it. But I am wandering.

Dick soon introduced me to Thomas, whom I took to be an honest, steady boy. Musing on this incident I went into the meeting-house. May there not be, I said to myself, something providential in this? I recollected that many people do not believe in special providences; yet, just then, the conviction of their reality clung very close to my heart. Indeed, I was in no mood to debate a question which strung me for the work of the day; and which afforded me so easy and so pleasing a solution of the presence of Dick and Thomas. Let fatalists talk as they may, thought I, I believe there is something in this. For why should God conde-

scend to give His Son to save us; and yet decline to guide some trivial incident of life, when it can be made subservient to that great end? Or why should He think it worth while to number the very hairs of our heads; and still overlook the small, worldly affair which may help to save the immortal spirit? If He is not ashamed to watch the fall of sparrows, is it unworthy of Him to so link the events of earth as to make one, now and then, so fall out, as to help on his way back some prodigal longing to return? This may all be superstition; but I confess I envy not him his cold incredulity who can so regard it. I love the thought to lie close to my heart, that on even the humblest child of man, God looks ever more with special solicitude. Earth in its truer features is but the type of Heaven. Here the mother sends her earnest wish with her boy wherever he wanders. Tell me not, then, that God leaves that child to pass through life a deserted and unnoticed orphan. Never.

But I was now in the meeting-house. The audience was of good size; yet not a Christian in it had come fifteen miles to worship that day, save Dick. Is not this a critique, I asked myself, on the small zeal of the proud white man? He does not toil; yet he travels no fifteen miles to meeting. I thought of the previous week's labor of Dick. He might, with much reason, have claimed that day as a day of rest. I counted again his fifteen miles, and then went to work with heart. Thomas was in that congregation—a circumstance which I determined not to forget for the next hour and a half. In other words, though many were present, I intended my audience to consist, except by chance, of a single person. In my boyhood's days, when hunting was the idol of my heart, I loved the single, fatal rifle shot. I resolved to try it now. In my speech I kept steadily in mind a plain, honest boy of sixteen. I knew if he had no great, cultivated mind to comprehend the subtleties of Christianity, he had an anxious, yearning heart to *feel* its blessed provisions. To this I trusted largely; and never have I trusted it in vain. Let him who sets out to preach, early learn this lesson, that man has a heart as well as a head. Logic is for this, love and sympathy for that. The one requires large culture in the hearer, the other large honesty in the speaker. The one cannot be misguided, the other should not. Logic merely cracks nuts; but love and sympathy unseal fountains of kindness; and few men, after all, are so lost as to be wholly devoid of the latter. In preaching I have always found it both safe and profitable to trust largely to the spiritual and better instincts of the human family. With them all are richly endowed, and, no doubt, for wise and gracious ends. But I am wandering again.

My discourse, as already intimated, was to Thomas; and was

exceedingly plain. It consisted in a simple statement of what Christ had done for him, and now required of him. In plowman's phrase, I told the tale. This was my early dialect, and I spoke it to perfection. I felt that, might be, the interests of an immortal spirit were staked on that speech. I did not wish to make it too long; nor was I willing to stop short of the mark. At length I guessed the time and closed. My invitation ended, Thomas came forward and gave me his hand. Poor Dick was as near Heaven then, as he will ever be again, till he reaches that blessed abode. He could not sit, he could not stand, he did not shout, but clapped his hands; while tears ran over those toil-worn cheeks. He meekly occupied a distant corner of the house; and I felt, if angels delight to gather around the heart that is all full of gratitude to Christ, surely they must have a strange pleasure in folding their wings in that corner just then. I borrowed clothes for Thomas, and immersed him that evening. He and Dick retraced those fifteen miles; but, in what mood, the true heart needs not be told. The day had been a glorious one to me; and I returned home happy and thankful.

Two weeks after this, I was going to an appointment at Lexington, same State, when, within about one mile of their home, I met Dick and Thomas in the road. I need not say they were glad to see me. As Thomas was a quiet boy, Dick did most of the talking. "You have stirred up the Devil in this neighborhood," he began. (Dick alluded to the preachers!) "Since you baptized Thomas, the preachers have made you their text generally, sometimes Thomas; and, sir, they have even stooped to talk of poor Dick. For the Lord's sake come and preach for us just once, if no more." Dick, said I, on next Wednesday, God willing, I shall return this way on my road home. If you and Thomas will smooth off the top of a stump, under some shade trees, somewhere in the neighborhood, and will circulate the appointment, on that day, at eleven, I will preach for you. "God bless you," replied Dick, "you shall have a place to preach, if Thomas and I have to work every night from now till then." In a few minutes I took leave of Dick and Thomas, perfectly confident that this promise would be kept to the letter.

On the following Wednesday I returned. In the shade of some great trees, according to promise of Dick, I found a stand for myself, seats for the people; and close by, a Baptist church well locked. This last I at once interpreted as an evidence of a work of grace on the soul; and so felt perfectly content to speak out of doors. True, my stand was not an imposing one in appearance; nor were the seats of the model to suggest the easiest posture of body. But then from the one the Gospel could be preached, and

on the others heard; and what cared I for more than this? Long ago, in Missouri, in stands like this, stood James McBride, Allen Wright, Duke Young, and other men of like noble type; and preached Christ to the crowds that came to hear them—and seldom has it been better done. They are now gone to their rest; but a hundred years from this writing will still show traces of the vast, and now ill-appreciated, labors of these men of God. I felt proud to stand where they had stood, and humbly aid in carrying forward the work in which their lives had been spent.

The audience was large, unusually large for a Wednesday. A glance at it told me who they were, and what they were. They were an honest, agricultural people, blest with pertinent common sense and sound hearts. I deemed them a soil full of promise. There was a repose in the eye and an unsinister look, a candor in the expression of face, and an artlessness of manner, which filled me with hope. I felt inspired for the work of the day. The religious element of the audience was chiefly Methodist and Baptist. They were a plain, honest, unlettered people. Their prejudices I knew to be many and strong; and, believing them to be sincerely held, I determined to treat them tenderly. This course I have always found best with these parties. Among them are many truly pious and worthy people. They are deep in error, I verily believe, but this cannot be corrected by harshness. Let them be dealt with faithfully and firmly, but gently and in a good spirit. We, ourselves, do not like to be treated harshly. Let us remember this in dealing with others.

I had only that day and one more to remain in the neighborhood, without making a disappointment in a distant county, which I was most anxious to avoid. I consequently resolved to make the most of my limited time. Accordingly, I spoke for two hours and thirty minutes—an unconscionable length of time I grant. The attention was profound and most respectful. Indeed I never saw better. I felt sure a deep and good impression had been made. The audience lingered on the ground, as if enchanted. The discourse was freely spoken of. Some dissented; but the greater number heartily approved. Many said, to use their own language, "If that was Campbellism they had been Campbellites all their lives. It was the very thing they read in their Bibles, and was good enough for them." An appointment was made for the next day, and the congregation separated.

The next day came and found the audience undiminished in size. Again the discourse reached through two hours and a half. At the close, four of the neighbor men came forward to confess their faith in Christ. The excitement was intense. Many a bosom, then, for the first time, heaved with deep, religious emotion; and

men, unused to tears, bravely wept. I loved to see this. The heart that can weep is not wholly corrupt; and when men turn to Christ, I like to see them deeply broken in spirit. Let the proud heart be melted, and tears stream freely; it is well. There is hope in such tokens. The scene now to be enacted was an unusual one in that community. We had met in the shade of grand old trees. Never had Christ, there, in that primeval forest, been confessed after the primitive manner. The audience was silent as the dead. Each of those four strong men then formally and solemnly avowed his faith in Christ. We sang a song, gave them the hand and said, "God be with you." The old members of the Stanley church now came out, and greeted these their neighbors, and greeted each other; and in the joy of that glad hour forgot the privations of past years. Last of all came Dick—that same Dick, gentle reader, that traveled those fifteen miles, and took with him Thomas. His heart was full. "Thank God," was all he said, as he shook my hand and passed on to his seat.

I now felt that it would be highly improper to leave that audience in its present mood, and proceed to another appointment where, possibly, nothing might be accomplished; and so resolved to stay. Meeting was accordingly announced for the next day; and we again adjourned. On the following day, eight confessed their faith in Christ. Thus the meeting continued, from day to day, until about forty were immersed. I give the number merely from memory.

Shortly after this, we met, about a mile distant, at a more convenient spot, for the purpose of organizing a church. The day was a glorious one—being the ever-memorable first of the week. Previous devotion had prepared the brethren for the occasion. The whole country flocked together to witness the scene. The new converts were all present. Here, too, had come all that remained of the old Stanley church to take their seats once more in an assembly of the saints. Their joy was complete. They had long been disbanded. Meantime, their children had grown up; and in the recent meeting many of them had entered the family of God. Now, parents, and children, and neighbors, sat down together to have their names enrolled as members of the "one body." Lovely was that sight! The object of the meeting was concisely, but clearly set forth. All were made fully sensible of the solemn step about to be taken. Appropriate portions of Scripture were read; and the names of the brethren then taken down in a book provided for the purpose. A hymn was now sung, and they gave each other the right hand of fellowship. The protection of the "Great Shepherd of the Sheep" was then fervently invoked on that little flock; and it was committed to His keeping. Will these

dear brethren ever forget that day, that scene, and the resolutions there formed? I trust not.

A table was then spread; and on it were placed the emblematic loaf and cup. The supper was then eaten in memory of the Master, a song sung, and the services of the hour closed.

A question now arose as to where their future meetings should be held. It was unanimously agreed that they should be held on that spot. It was the base of a gentle hill looking toward the South. But what name should it bear? With one consent it was called South Point. It lies in Ray county, Missouri. Thus originated the name South Point, and the Church meeting there. It is very dear to the writer of this piece. He may never more see these brethren in the flesh. His fervent prayer is, that they may be ever true to their high calling. Also, will they remember to be kind to Dick, to whom, in the providence of God, they owe their existence as a church?

Here, on this same spot, these brethren subsequently built them a house; and here do they still continue to meet to worship God. On the top of that gentle hill sleep the remains of Jacob Warriner. His grave, like a faithful sentinel, looks ever down on the house at its base. It is hallowed ground. May God keep and bless the church that is planted there.

Thus, kind reader, to a single act of a servant man in his fidelity to Christ, do I trace the origin of a church, the joy of a neighborhood, and the salvation of many a soul. You may think it accidental; be not angry with me if I see fit to view it in a different light.

SIMPLICITY OF THOUGHT.—"I know nothing which more shews the essential and inherent perfection of simplicity of thought, above that which I call the Gothic manner in writing, than this; the first pleases all kinds of palates, and the latter only such as have formed to themselves a wrong artificial taste upon little fanciful authors and writers of epigram. Homer, Virgil, or Milton, so far as the language of their poems is understood, will please a reader of plain common sense, who would neither relish nor comprehend an epigram of Martial or a poem of Cowley; so, on the contrary, an ordinary song or ballad, that is the delight of the common people, cannot fail to please all such readers as are not unqualified for the entertainment by their affectation or ignorance; and the reason is plain, because the same paintings of nature which recommend it to the most ordinary reader, will appear beautiful to the most refined."—*Spectator*.

ALLEN WRIGHT.

Few names are more cherished in large portions of Missouri than that of ALLEN WRIGHT, and none better deserves the esteem in which it is held. His sterling worth, his piety, and work, entitle him to a larger notice than he has yet received at the hand of any one of our brethren. His steadfast friend and brother, the amiable and gentle Longan, wrote for the A. C. Review an affectionate notice of his death; but we think his memory entitled to a still more lengthy notice.

Brother Wright was born in 1810, and died in 1860, in the fiftieth year of his age.

In personal appearance he was about six feet tall, and weighed usually, I should think, not less than one hundred and ninety pounds. His body presented the appearance of being very compactly built, though it is questionable whether this was really so. Physically he did not seem to lack strength, though I should think he lacked toughness. He endured hardships and toil well, though at times would let down rather unaccountably, which seemed to argue that his physical organism was not perfect as many would have taken it to be. His skeleton was not large for a man of his weight, and presented the appearance rather of breadth and fullness, than of great solidity. His body was not symmetrical, though it was by no means ungainly. It conformed rather to the model of the heavy working man than to the graceful ideal of the Greek. With a body built as his seemed to be, a man should live, with ordinary care, to the age of eighty, though he fell thirty years short of that. His walk was dull and heavy, as were most of his bodily movements; they lacked suppleness and ease. He moved as if he was always tired; and in his gait had the halting manner of one excessively fatigued.

His face was unusually large, being broad, bony, and rather long. His features were not prominent, but retiring. His face below his eyes had a hanging expression, indicative of mingled infirmity and sadness. His mouth was large, his lips usually compressed with a good deal of firmness. His eyes were steady with a look of unusual repose, but decidedly lacking in expression. This was heightened by a very perceptible blemish in one of them. His forehead was a noble one; it was the only truly classic feature in his face; being high, broad, and admirably formed, with an appearance rather tabular, than regular. The general expression of his face was that of great honesty, candor, firmness, and plainness. No one the least acquainted with human nature, would ever have suspected, from his look, either a crook in his purpose, or a

flaw in his heart. The expression of his face was also benevolent, and ordinarily a little sad, which gave to it a deep religious cast. His head was large, and filled with a fine powerful brain.

Brother Wright's raising had evidently been remarkably plain; indeed, it would do no injustice to the truth to say it had been decidedly rustic. But what it had lacked in blandishments and polish, it had more than made up in a large endowment of sincerity and truth. He had been reared an honest boy, and made an honest man. He never recovered from the effect of his early training. Perhaps it is due to his memory to say he never made the attempt. The artificial life of the city, and the redundant airs and manners of the wealthy, were themes for which he never evinced even the smallest love. Yet Allen Wright was neither a boor nor a clown. He looked at everything in the light of the Bible, and brought even the smallest affair of life to the test of its severe simplicity. He neither studied nor respected the etiquette of which it knows nothing. He was plain in his look, plain in his talk, plain at home, plain abroad, plain in the pulpit, plain out of it, plain always, plain everywhere. Yet let no one suppose that he had not a just appreciation of the decent and the proper. He loved a nice thing, whether it was something said, or something done; but then he wanted it simple and unadorned. He admired the pure gem, but had no use for the jetty base in which it had been set to help it to shine. I need not stop to remind the reader how much his love of the plain, and especially how much his constant exemplification of it, commended and endeared him to the common people of the country where he traveled. A crust of bread and a cup of water were good enough for him; yet the best dinner the country-wife could get, (and know you, reader, that is not bad,) was got for Allen Wright. A blanket and a board were all the bed he asked, yet if the humble cabin boasted a plethoric tick and a clean linen, Allen Wright slept on them, that he did. If there was a memorable chair, or a cosy spot of a cold night in that honest abode, he got it. He drank his tea out of the brand new "keepsake" cup, and smoked the choicest bits of the "patch" out of grandmother's new pipe and through her new cane stem—an honor to which no mortal might aspire save Allen Wright. Other preachers might say sharp things, but the whole house went into ecstasies only at his wit, (reader, he had not a bit;) other men might be good, but none could equal him; others preached well, he divinely. It is hardly just perhaps to say, that this high appreciation of the common people was due solely to his plainness; but certainly it had much to do in commending to their affectionate regard this excellent man. In this respect I cannot refrain from thinking that his admirable example might be followed much more closely, and with the happiest results, even

by us all. A great man does not let himself down in the esteem — of the truly wise, by becoming one of the humble, honest mass, to save them.

As to education, Brother Wright had simply none; and it is but just to add, that what he knew he did not have, he never made the slightest pretensions to. Not that his mind was wholly untrained; for he had read other books some, had studied the Bible much, and had thought a great deal. As a Christian man he was highly educated; and when we speak of him as not being educated, we are using the word in its worldly, and not in its noblest sense. His pronunciation was bad, his grammar wretched. Yet few men commanded larger audiences than he; while hardly one profited them more. It was with him always a source of sincere regret that his early training had been so much neglected. He took no vulgar pride in being uncultivated. He spoke of it seldom but always sadly. And no noble nature ever heard Allen Wright discourse for an hour, especially when he bounded off in one of his better moods, without feeling ready to weep that some wealthy member of the church had not had the magnanimity to afford that fine mind an opportunity of becoming all it might have been. Had such been the case, Allen Wright would have handed down some name, now perhaps justly rotted, but then blazoned with honor, to ages yet to come. Though thus rude in speech, you soon forgot when listening to him such minor faults. Fine traits in his preaching soon dimmed mere educational defects, and left you only admiring the strong brain that was working in your presence.

In one respect Brother Wright's course is deserving of the highest praise. He was sensible of his defective education; and to a certain extent, it rendered him sensitive and shy. Yet he saw that notwithstanding he could be of great service to his fellow-men. He accordingly resolved that though he might not work so artistically as others, yet his days should be consecrated to the cause of Christ. And most worthily he kept that resolution. Yet how many men are there who would have buried even Allen Wright's fine native abilities to do good, because, forsooth, they cannot boast a classic education—men who because they cannot flash on the world like meteors refuse to glow like the humble worm. Yet such God will not acquit. Every man has his talent, has his sphere; and our motto is, let all work who can. Let him who is educated work, let him who is not educated work, let him work who has ten talents, let him work who has one, let all work, and none be despised. We are working to save men's immortal spirits, to save them from endless ruin, to save them in Heaven; who then may be idle? God is working, Christ is work-

ing, the Spirit is working, truth is working, angels are working, hell is working, and dare a man be idle, idle when he is the prize wrought for? Never. We repeat let all work.

We never regarded brother Wright's mind as of the most subtle and delicate mould. Breadth and comprehension were its characteristics rather than fineness. It did not lack quickness so much as minuteness. Broad, grasping sense he did not want, but sharp, analytic sense he did. His thoughts had reach enough but they lacked pertinence. He saw a thing clearly, but saw it in its larger and not in its smaller sections. His mind perceived rather readily, but not immediately and intuitively. Education would, no doubt, have improved very much some of these mental traits; still it would never have materially altered the main characteristics of his mind. He would never have made a metaphysician nor an analyst. In synthesis he would have excelled, but failed in analysis. In obvious truths and general facts he would have made a master workman, but in criticism and invention he would always have stood low. Of originality his mind exhibited few traces. It was fitted to work on material furnished to hand, and not to create them. Such materials lost nothing by him, though he seldom added any thing to them. This was owing perhaps not less to caution than to mental idiosyncrasy. He was afraid of new things, especially in religion. He never attempted to make discoveries, and was distrustful of those made by others. A new thought never carried him away suddenly. He eyed it with reserve until by slow degrees he became thoroughly convinced of its truth. He then embraced it with great cordiality, and held it with marvelous firmness.

But Brother Wright's power lay not so much in his mind as in his religious and moral traits. He was eminently social. Few men mingled with the masses so successfully as he. His sound heart was free from all malice and imbued with the largest love. He delighted in the free off-hand life of the crowd, especially the religious crowd. He was moulded by it rather than moulded it. He caught at once its easy, innocent spirit; and delighted more than most men in its flow of racy, kindly feeling. He laughed heartily, abounded in rustic anecdotes, which he told only tolerably well, listened to what even a child would say, and replied frankly; did not flatter any one, but approved almost every thing that seemed not positively wrong. In his salutations he was cordial, usually rather grave and sentimental, and never light nor trashy. His entire intercourse with the world was marked by the most perceptible sincerity, kindness, and truth. In a crowd he did not seem grand but good; he struck no one remarkably, but left all loving him for his artlessness and purity. The common

people saw in him what no one else saw in him but the common people, all for the reason that he never neglected them nor slighted them. He got close to them and they came close to him. In the humble honest crowd Allen Wright was always king. His adaptation to them and to their ways was perfect; and they repaid him with an affection as pure as it was universal. To see him in a frontier cabin, with hat off, coat off, boots off, sitting a little heavily in the chimney corner, with the domestic cob pipe, smoking, spitting, and talking to the family in his own peculiarly grave and tender style; and the secret of his wonderful power over the masses became at once explained. With that humble family in all its poverty, its toils, its hardships, its sorrows, its bereavements, he sympathized with a depth, which made him the idol of their hearts and the delight of their homes. To be in one such honest abode, just after dinner, as the christian mother stood beside her table washing her dishes, and told him the simple story of her buried dead; to witness the feeling with which he entered into that tale, and drank in those maternal sobs; to hear his comfortings, and see him gild the future with the hope of its reunions in Christ; and dull must have been the eye that could not see an element of true greatness in Allen Wright. No bosom carried a sorrow too secret or too sacred for him. He was the confidant and the comforter of the stricken spirit. Wherever death had blighted hopes or crushed hearts, all leaned on him and wept as on a father. God had mellowed his noble heart by afflictions in his own family, and thus fitted him to act his part with wondrous effect in scenes like these. I never thought him so great as when comforting the sorrowing children of earth, and pointing them to the coming recompense.

But though so successful, and delighting so much in the crowd, Allen Wright's highest pleasure was had, perhaps, in the society of a little knot of cordial friends. He could not long and well endure the restraints of the crowd. He loved to steal away where he could unbend a little and indulge the luxury of careless ease. Give him the shade of a fine tree, a bluegrass turf, a comfort, a chair turned down with a pillow on it, a pitcher of cool water, with one or two trusty friends denuded of all superfluous dress, and he was peculiarly at home. Now let the conversation turn on some religious theme, especially one looking to the glorious future which ever charmed him most, and you saw Allen Wright in his pride. Beneath this shade he loved to loiter and talk. If now and then, when the conversation was of men and things, it took a little mischievous turn, it was far from displeasing him. He had a vein of dry humor which he was very fond of indulging; and it is no more than truth to say that it was not always confined within

the limits of strict propriety. His jesting was at times a little coarse. The usually select crowd, however, in which alone he would indulge in any thing of the kind, rendered it comparatively harmless. Still nothing of the sort is to be admired, and certainly not imitated. Christian preachers should in all places and at all times be most chaste and pure in their conversation.

As a traveling companion Brother Wright had no superior. The predominant tone of his life was perhaps a slight sadness. On occasions of traveling it was very perceptibly so. Then his conversation was incessant and of the most elevated and pious cast. I never delighted in his society so much as when traveling from one appointment to another, or from some distant meeting homeward. Many a weary night have we journeyed thus together. These scenes are now gone, alas, forever! but the memory of them is delicious still. Over broad prairies, and through deep woods, across gentle ridges and delightful vales, we plodded slowly on together. The light of the moon, and shadows cast by waving forest trees as they silently glided about us, imparted to many a piece of road the mystic air of an enchanted spot; while the gruff hoot of the owl, or the melancholy notes of the whippowil, served only to deepen the sullen gloom of night. Still on we went talking of the toils of the past and the hopes of the future. Give me a companion like Allen Wright, a scene like this, and converse pure and sweet as his, and I ask for nothing more divine on earth.

Though endowed with a degree of firmness which would sometimes seem to assume the form of needless obstinacy, yet at times Brother Wright became both fickle and timid. The most trivial domestic incident would at times cause him to make a disappointment. Indeed, to such an extent was he affected by the weakness of which we are speaking, that it may be safely said he made more disappointments than any other man in the State in the same length of time. Circumstances which would not have cost other men, greatly his inferiors, a thought, would deject his spirit, and cause him to remain at home. This was a marked infirmity. Yet let no one suppose that he thought lightly of an appointment, or undervalued an occasion of doing good. Such was not the case. But when his weakness came on him, it became completely his master.

Brother Wright's preaching was characterized by breadth of thought and great plainness. Two more needed traits it would be hard to name indeed. As a general rule he understood his whole subject, and understood it well; and what he understood well himself he made others see very clearly. His preaching at times struck me as clumsy. His subject seemed to hang on his hands. His mind did not dash it off with ease and sprightliness. There

was something not merely awkward in his mode of getting at his subject, but dragging in his manner of treating it. Still even at these times there was no lack of matter; only his mind seemed to work lazily on it. If, when attempting to preach, he discovered that his mind was in one of these moods, he became embarrassed at once, and seldom recovered from it during that speech.

In style he was strong and simple. He never made an effort to do or be any thing beyond himself. His words were the common terms of every day life, and were arranged with no reference either to elegance or effect. His style, though never polished, became at times truly majestic. Its force was wonderful. Its rude grandeur positively amazed you. He would now and then get off an episode replete with brilliancy and quick with power. But as a general rule his style would have been denominated inelegant and ordinary. Its great ornament was its impressiveness. In the pulpit Brother Wright was always earnest—earnest as though in the chamber of death. His look was grave and deeply serious. Preaching with him was an affair with which men might not sport. For him it had the solemnity of the grave and the judgment bar. He hence entered into it with profound earnestness. In preaching his zeal burned steadily though it never flamed high; it was always liquid and warm but never rampant. Here it was that the deep sympathies of his noble nature, and the tender affections of his pure heart displayed themselves with their most magic effect. Even where he failed to convince men, he seldom failed to make them feel. And though he did not always succeed in greatly illuminating the mind, he never failed to fill it with holy emotions and leave it in a deeply religious frame.

In no one thing had nature done more for Brother Wright than in the sweet sonorous voice with which it had blessed him. Much of his wealth lay here. It afforded the amplest vent for his whole mind and all his feelings. Voluminous and penetrating, it made him seem great even where both his matter and style were common. I never knew a voice better adapted to exhortation than his; and few men excelled Allen Wright in exhortation. His voice was not pre-eminently adapted to didactic purposes; for it lacked dryness and clearness. But its subtle, penetrating flow rendered it marvelously suited to exhortation. Long after his discourse was ended, the intonations of his voice lingered in the chords of the soul sweet as the dying notes of an Eolian harp. When the genial feelings of his heart flowed out over an audience, gush after gush, in this fine voice, they became almost resistless. When wearied with speaking his voice at times would become a little undulating, that is, it rose and fell at regular intervals, and then its effect on the masses was almost tragic. With them his preach-

ing was never so divine and unctuous as then. It was a trait in his voice I never admired, and think all preachers should studiously avoid imitating it.

Brother Wright's preaching was eminently rudimental. Indeed, the plain truth is, that he preached well, nothing else. The first principles of the Gospel were his themes and his delight. He understood them thoroughly and preached them as well as he understood them. To this fact, more than to all others besides, is to be ascribed his success. Faith, repentance, and baptism were subjects full of interest with him for seven discourses in the week. On other subjects his mind worked heavily, on these always glibly; on others it might halt, on these it bounded grandly through without a pause. When preaching on these elementary topics he dotted every i, crossed every t, and still dashed nimbly on saying nothing that should not be said, and omitting nothing that should. He was never so truly great as when truly elementary. And no matter what may be said against such preaching, it is, after all, that in which the world has the deepest interest. That man will always be the truest benefactor of his fellow-men who fills their minds with the largest measure of the first principles of the Gospel. With these they will seldom go greatly astray, without them they will never go right. The consequence was that with some people Brother Wright was not so popular as a preacher as he justly deserved to be. The fault was in them not in him. No better evidence can be afforded of a decline of Christianity in a man's heart than to see him evince the least distaste for its first truths. We can no more have a prosperous religion without them than we can a healthy human body without a sound well knit skeleton.

We regret to have witnessed at times even amongst our own brethren a sneer at the kind of preaching of which we are now speaking. We have never failed to be deeply pained by every manifestation of the kind. We trust it has resulted from thoughtlessness, more than from any real dislike of such preaching. We are no advocate of exclusiveness, but we hope never to see the day come when there shall be the least falling away from the healthful elementary preaching done by men like Allen Wright. Whenever a sickly sentimentalism, which cannot endure such preaching, begins to infest the Church, the day of its degeneracy has come. We by no means mean that such preaching is to be done by all preachers at all times. What we mean is that enough of it shall be done by all, and that no one shall be despised because he can do little else. If the sectarian world sees fit to sneer at such preaching, be it so. If by that means it could drive us from this stronghold and the use of the instrument most fatal to itself, a grand object would be achieved truly. Let us be careful to select

our position, in the first place, at a safe distance from extremes, and then immovably hold it. To those who are competent to discuss the more difficult and recondite themes of the Gospel, we say let them with becoming prudence do it; but let them never drop a remark to wound the feelings of the more humble worker and drive him from his field of usefulness. Neither let the latter be envious of and feel unkindly towards the former.

Though a faithful man and a beloved preacher, the Churches always managed to keep Brother Wright poor, very poor. Not one tenth of his time during his life if the horse he rode had laid down and died could he have replaced it with another without going in debt. And never was he able to command the means to school his children as they deserved to be. This was not right. Yet he was a man of most temperate and economical habits. It is proper to add that towards the close of his life a few Churches in Lafayette county, Missouri, evinced a higher appreciation of this excellent man and made his worldly affairs a little easier. Still he died worth about nothing. His noble heart was many a time made sad by the extreme want to which himself and family were reduced. He has often mentioned to the writer how low he had been at times reduced, and though he never chided he spoke with grief.

The laity tell me they do not believe in making preachers rich. Neither do I. But, brethren, I do believe in making them comfortable, in supporting them this side of want, and in affording these faithful men the means of schooling their children well. Is this right? But why, pray, do you not believe in making preachers rich? Do you think it would hurt them? You cannot say it would; for you have never made one rich, to know. Suppose before you longer preach your doctrine with so much confidence in its truth, you test it by making at least one preacher rich. Hitherto you have kept them all poor; let us now have at least one exception to your rule. You are satisfied that it works well one way. We should then all be satisfied that it works well both ways. Preachers are not all satisfied that you are right in what you say, neither will they be until, by making at least one of them rich you convince them that you are so. Do you think it would hurt *you* to be rich, or hurt *your* children to educate them well, and thereby enable them to move in genteel circles? Of course you do not. How then can you imagine that it would *wound* your preacher, or injure his children to make him rich? You tell me it would cause him to neglect his calling. But how do you know this? You have never made one rich, to have the point tested. Would making you rich cause you to neglect your calling? Why then should you think it would cause the preacher to neglect his? The

closer you stick to your calling the richer you grow. Think you not, if the preacher, too, could grow daily richer by sticking to his calling, that he would not stick to it close indeed. But the difference is, that the closer you stick to your calling the richer you grow, while the closer he sticks to his the poorer he grows. Is there not something wrong. But tell me truly, faithful brother, do you preach this doctrine really believing it. Is it really so that you do not believe in making preachers rich, and that, too, because it would hurt them and cause them to neglect their calling? Or is not this a mere plea to shield your own purse? Beware.

But, brethren, I do not believe in making preachers rich. Give me then only enough to live on while I live, enough to educate my children well, and still enough more to buy each a wedding coat, and the Lord knows you may have all the rest.

Among the uneducated preachers it too often happens, we are sorry to know, that envyings and jealousies exist towards the educated. These are unlovely infirmities; and where they really exist never fail to leak out through some unguarded channel. In Allen Wright I am glad to say I never saw a trace of them. It cost him no pain to see a brother preacher polished, gifted, and standing higher than himself. Would that all men were blessed with a like noble nature. If brethren whose misfortune it is to be infected with these frailties, could only know how transparent they are, and how unamiable these weaknesses look, they would surely make great efforts either to conceal or extinguish them. On the other hand, let the more favored preachers ever exhibit a high disinterestedness, and by their deep humility and just appreciation of their humbler brethren and their work, give them no cause to think unkindly. Thus shall we be happy in each other's society, while perishing humanity will be something the gainer.

Brother Wright, though not to be pronounced a great man without qualification, was pre-eminently a sound man. He was sound in his preaching, sound in his counsel, sound in his intentions, sound in every thing. With all classes he consequently stood high. He was not slow but cautious, not hasty but considerate, and as a general rule spoke only at the right time and said only the right thing. Few men will ever in this respect leave behind them a more enviable name than he has left. New educational schemes, new missionary schemes never carried him away suddenly. Yet he was the steadfast friend of them all. At all times ready to work for the good of the human family, all he wanted to know was that he was working to effect, and with the Divine sanction.

He was a great admirer of the amiable Barton W. Stone, and

in his spirit and life exhibited many points of resemblance between himself and that pious man. That many traits in his preaching were copied from him we do not hesitate to think; for brother Wright was a copyist. He absorbed your thoughts, copied your manner and even the intonations of your voice as unconsciously as a babe mimics its mother. By some this was regarded as a defect in his preaching. I confess I never thought it so. In other men it might have been offensive, but in Allen Wright it was not. It was done so innocently, and with all, so effectively, that it gave me pleasure, never pain. You need have no fear that he would copy your faults; and if he did not copy you at all, you might well suspect that you had few excellences; for he was a shrewd observer and knew a nice thing he heard it or saw it. Had he been early and well educated it might have corrected this tendency to copying, by rendering him more independent and self-reliant. But so deeply was the trait marked in his nature that it is questionable whether even that would have freed him wholly from it.

The cause for which we are pleading, *the return of the world to primitive Christianity*, commanded his profoundest admiration and sympathy. It filled him with hope and made him ready to endure every conceivable kind of toil and hardship for its sake. All other themes shrank to nothing with him in comparison with this. The sublimest thought of his heart was the union of all God's children on the simple basis of the truth. It was a theme on which he delighted to preach, and on none did even he preach better. His faith was, that it will take the world; and when it was rejected he despaired for him who did it. Spread it, was his motto, in every way; spread it in books, spread it in periodicals, spread it in tracts, spread it in the pulpit, spread it out of it, spread it by all means, and at every cost. To this great end were devoted the thirty best years of his life. He thought of nothing but this. He cared for nothing if this went on. It was the idol of his great heart. Home was abandoned, want endured, perils encountered, regions traversed far and near, through bitter cold and scorching heat—all that this great work might go on. It gives me deep pleasure to honor him still for his whole-hearted devotion to this great cause.

As a preacher, I think he admired no man living or dead so much as he did the laborious and lamented Johnson. He accounted it one of the chief pleasures of his life that he had been permitted to stand beside that great evangelist in the last moments of his life. He spoke always of his death with deep regret, and of his active self-sacrificing life with an affection little short of devotion. Nor was it any mean honor done even John T. Johnson, that this noble commoner of Missouri, stood over him in his part-

ing moment, and wiped the death drop from his brow. A more worthy hand could not have performed that service.

Brother Wright was excessively fond of music, and the time had been when he sang most sweetly. But even when I first knew him his voice was well nigh gone. Still it even then retained the soft plaintive ring of time past. The songs he admired were the sentimental and the sad, the airs he preferred the plaintive and slow. This accorded with the rather melancholy cast of his mind, and served at the same time to indicate the deeply pious tone of his heart. When walking across the floor or riding along the road, I have often heard him hum some fine old air so feelingly as to cast a shade of deep sadness over my spirit. These were pleasant moments to spend with Allen Wright—moments when you wished to be left alone to your own silent thoughts.

The remains of Allen Wright lie in Lafayette county, Missouri, about fifteen miles south of Lexington. The spot selected for his grave was a little grove in which stands a plain church where he often preached, and in which he made his last speech. At the north end of this humble house, and deep in its shadow, he sleeps. It is in the midst of a rural district of great moral worth, where we have many brethren whom he dearly loved, and who dearly loved him. They still cherish his memory with deep affection. In that silent wood, in the shade of that plain house, among those plain brethren, is a fitting place for the dust of plain Allen Wright to rest.

SYSTEMS OF THEOLOGY.—In making a commencement where I now make it, for finding the starting-point of a creed, I escape the danger which has been so fearlessly met by the framers of symbols, namely: The presuming myself to know vastly more than I do, or ever can know. The Divine Nature, so far as it may be apprehended by the human mind, must become known to it in quite another manner than that of abstract speculation, or of logical deductions. And yet systems of theology are made up of propositions concerning the INFINITE BEING, which propositions, if I follow them out in logical order, lead me not into light, but into utter darkness—the darkness either of universal doubt, or of material Atheism.—*Taylor.*

DO THE UNIMMERSED COMMUNE?

[This article was written last year during the pendency of the discussion to which it alludes. Some of its expressions may, therefore, sound at this date a little out of time. It is not, however, deemed necessary to alter them now. At the time when they were penned the Quarterly was expected to be started soon.]

THE subject of communion has been, for some time, engrossing much of the attention of our brotherhood. It has been conspicuously discussed both in the *Millennial Harbinger* and in the *American Christian Review*. Brethren Pendleton and Errett have occupied most of the space in the former work; brother Franklin has occupied most of the space in the latter. It cannot be denied that at times the discussion has become a little piquant; and I have thought that now and then I could even taste in it some slight traces of acetic acid and salt. Perhaps this was all imaginary. But suppose it was not, what then? I love to read a thing when it becomes a little racy, and can stand it well when it becomes even a little rare, to use a favorite term of the Epicurean, when ordering his steak. I do not mean that I like to see a discussion look bloody; but with me let it look almost any way rather than cadaverous. Away with that sickly sentimentalism which screams out at every strong epithet of an earnest man! I love epithets; and if they detonate like percussion caps or flash like meteors, all the better. Only let them be not unbecoming the gravity of religious discussion and the fraternity of Christians. As for the condiments just named, they are excellent things, as is well known even to children. Salt is a capital disinfectant, keeping out bad odors, and both salt and acetic acid have fine conservative properties. Even religious discussions cannot do well without them.

Some brethren have augured ill from the discussion as conducted in these two journals. Frightful rents and heresies in the church have suddenly shot across their horizon. I shall not deny that I have seen some things to regret; yet I have seen nothing to fear. When brethren become earnest in a discussion we are not to infer wrath; neither when they differ in opinion are we to infer heresies. Good will surely come out of this discussion, and in the end we shall be a wiser, if not a better, people.

I believe the discussion to be both necessary and well-timed—well-timed because it serves to give a little employment to our thoughts at a time when they greatly need employment on Christian themes—necessary, because it will lead to more definite as well as more accurate views of a most important subject. Heretofore communion has occupied no great share of our attention. Our views and language respecting it are, in many instances, borrowed wholly

from the parties around us, and not derived immediately from the word of God. The subject needs a thorough reconsideration, and our views and speech, where either may be defective, a thorough correction. Hitherto we have deemed a few hasty paragraphs, or a few very brief, and frequently very unstudied remarks at the table, quite enough to set forth the true conception of this impressive and significant rite. Possibly in this we have been wrong. Now that the subject is before the brotherhood in a mooted form, let it receive a patient, and, if need be, a protracted examination. Still no lengthy examination of the subject is proposed in the present paper. A statement of it, as I understand it, is what is proposed rather than an elaborate discussion of it.

The present discussion, be it remembered, is one confined entirely to our brotherhood. We are not conducting it with others, but strictly amongst ourselves. This being so, the following particulars may be assumed :

1. That belief in Christ, a fixed purpose to forsake sin, and the immersion of the body in water, are necessary to constitute a man a Christian—always and everywhere necessary. In other words, and generally, it is here assumed that it takes two things to constitute a man a Christian; namely: 1. The right spirit or mental frame; 2. The right act or acts; and that no more can the right spirit, without the right acts, constitute him a Christian, than can the right acts, without the right spirit. What I mean by the right spirit and the right acts is the spirit and acts prescribed in the New Testament. With the right spirit, without the right acts, a man may be eminently good and pious, but he is not a Christian. Though he should be in spirit only as faultless as a seraph, he is not a Christian. God may esteem him very highly, much more so than many of the immersed, and even very certainly save him; still, with becoming decency be it said, he is not a Christian. In this case God esteems him as a good man and not as a Christian; and the distinction between the two is as palpable to thought, as is the distinction to the eye, between the words good and Christian employed to denote them respectively. With the right acts, without the right spirit, a man may be pre-eminently moral, still he is no Christian; and though all the world should pronounce him one, yet is he not one in the sight of God. These things, for the present, I take for granted without stopping to argue them.

2. That the Kingdom or Church is something wholly distinct from the world; that between them exists a line deep, legible, and ineffaceable; that from the world into the kingdom a man cannot pass except by a birth of water and spirit, and that without this birth he is not a Christian. With our brethren these positions are postulates and not matters of controversy.

3 That the institution called the Lord's Supper exists wholly within the kingdom; and in no sense nor in any part out of it.

Now, if these premises be correct, and correct I most conscientiously believe them to be, I then ask, how can a man who is out of the kingdom participate in a rite which exists wholly in it? If the man cannot enter the kingdom without being born again, nor the rite be removed out of the kingdom into the world; then it seems to me that participation in the rite by the man is impossible. If I set a table in my house it is most clear that no one can partake thereof without first entering the house. Equally clear would it seem to be, that no one can partake of the Lord's table without first entering the kingdom. May it not be, then, that in the present controversy we have been assuming as true what is, in fact, not true? We have been assuming that the unimmersed *do commune*; but may this not be false? I will not affirm that it is false; but I must deny that it is true. That the unimmersed *seem* to commune, I grant. Certain it is that they break the bread and drink the cup; but is this a genuine communion? It is what *we* call communion, I well know, but is it so viewed and so accepted by the Lord? Candidly I cannot think it. The case resembles a vitiated immersion. A man professes to believe in his heart that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, seems penitent and sincere; yet in fact he is not a believer. I immerse this man. Now, so far as I am concerned, so far as the audience is concerned, and so far as even the act itself is concerned, this seems a genuine immersion; yet in fact it is not so. The absence of faith has vitiated it, and it is not accepted by the Lord as the act appointed by him. Precisely so in the case of communion. A man to all human appearance communes—he certainly breaks the bread and drinks of the cup; yet this is not a real communion. The man is not in the kingdom, and this vitiates his act. It is hence not accepted of the Lord as the act appointed by Him. The act appointed by Him is appointed to be performed by none but a Christian; consequently when performed by any other, it is not the act appointed by him; hence it is no communion. Even granting that the communicant is perfectly sincere; still this cannot alter the nature of his act, only so far, it may be, as to render it uncriminal. Mere sincerity cannot entitle a man to commune; he must be a Christian and sincere, otherwise he neither can nor does commune. If a man be out of the kingdom, neither sincerity alone, nor sincerity and piety alone, can alter his relation thereto; neither consequently can they alone entitle him to commune. When out of the kingdom, but one thing can alter his relation to it; namely, a birth of water and spirit. This alone, therefore, can entitle him to commune.

But suppose a man to be a true believer in Christ, to be truly penitent, to be sprinkled and not immersed, and sincerely to think this baptism, to be a strictly moral man, and to feel in heart that he is a Christian—what then? May he not commune? I answer yes; *provided* it can be first shown that sincerely thinking so transmutes an act of sprinkling into an act of immersion, or causes God to accept the thing he has not appointed for the thing he has. Otherwise, I say, not that the man may not commune, but that he cannot and does not commune. The Christian man is not a character compounded of a mere bundle of good intentions and inferences; but a positive, determinate character, all of whose lineaments and qualifications are distinctly set down in the word of God, and without which a man is not a Christian. Men may clamor at this if they see fit, and string together whole scores of *ad captandum* questions put as mere appeals to the feelings and prejudices of the multitude: I heed them not. What! will retort the astounded opponent, utterly shocked and scandalized at the boldness of what is here said, do you mean to say that Martin Luther was not a Christian? I mean to say distinctly and emphatically that Martin Luther, if not immersed, was not a Christian—this is what I mean to say. I do not mean to deny that Martin Luther was eminently a good and pious man; neither do I mean to deny that God took him when he died—I deny that he was a Christian. Nor am I unapprised of the effect which writing thus, has on the feelings of many excellent and benevolent people; but for one, I cannot repress in my heart the deep, honest convictions thereof; at least I will not. It is high time that the world understood us on the present point; and that we understood ourselves. If we mean to teach without mincing the matter, that immersion, for this is the only difficulty in the way, is necessary, always and everywhere, since the founding of the kingdom, to constitute a Christian, let it be unqualifiedly said; and then let it stand forever as the unalterable expression of our faith. Or if we do not mean to teach thus, let us avow what we do mean to teach. Candidly I am tired of publishing to the world a tenet, as something taught in Holy Writ, and in the same breath proclaiming a set of inferences which falsify it. If a man can be a Christian without immersion, let the fact be shown; or if a man can or may commune without being a Christian, let the fact be shown. I deny both. Immovably I stand here. But I shall be told that this is Phariseeism, that it is exclusivism. Be it so; if it be true, and this is the only question with me respecting it, then am I so far the defendant of Phariseeism and exclusivism. I stagger at nothing if true, at every thing if false.

But I shall be told that I am missing the question; that the ques-

tion is, not whether a man can be a Christian without immersion, since it is conceded he cannot, but whether, if a pious, unimmersed person, who sincerely believes himself to have been baptized, and who feels in heart that he is a Christian and ought to commune—whether if he proposes to commune, I have the right to forbid him? I argue, first, that if he can really commune, that is, commune acceptably to God, he *may* commune; but, second, if he cannot commune acceptably to God, then he may not commune at all, and if he may not commune at all, then not only have I the right, but it is my solemn duty to forbid him to perform the act which he cannot perform. Suppose, now, that Brother Pendleton, for he is less likely than any one else to deem me capable of being discourteous towards him, or to take offense at the personality—suppose he should affirm, that this pious, unimmersed man can commune acceptably to God; and that therefore he has the right to do so. I ask Brother Pendleton how he knows this? and I make the question a special point. All he knows is, that the man who is certainly a Christian can commune acceptably; but that he who is not certainly a Christian can do so is something he does not know. How then dare he assert it? Should he assert it, however, not as a fact taught in the Bible, but as a mere opinion or honest inference, I then have no controversy with my brother, and love him none the less either for holding or expressing the opinion; only in that case I think him not so good a logician as his former pupil. Will he forgive this vanity?

But, on the other hand, suppose Brother Pendleton should ask me, how I know that the act of this pious, unimmersed person is not acceptable to God? I reply, I do not know it at all, neither is it my business to pretend to know it. I may legitimately deny that any act is, as an act of worship, acceptable to God, unless He has expressly or by implication enjoined it; and sure I am, He has never enjoined that the unimmersed either shall or may commune. True, the Bible does not expressly prohibit the unimmersed to commune; but then no one will contend that a man may do the things which the Bible does not prohibit, merely because it does not prohibit them. We infer duties, not from what the Bible does not say, but from what it does say.

But I shall be asked, what harm, after all, can come of the pious unimmersed's communing? I answer, if all men saw as far and thought as well as Brother Pendleton sees and thinks, perhaps but little harm would come of it. But such is not the case; and hence I think that evil only, and not good, must result from the practice. The conviction is somehow deeply, and I think most correctly, fixed in the popular mind, that none but a Christian may commune, and that if two men commune together, this is proof

positive that each regards the other as a Christian—(the latter part of the sentence is not necessarily correct.) But Brother Pendleton sets down and communes with the pious unimmersed, though holding that none but Christians may commune. From this act one of two inferences will be drawn, and no labor on his part can prevent it; namely, either that he holds the unimmersed to be Christians, and hence regards immersion as not necessary to becoming a Christian; or, if he regards immersion as necessary to becoming a Christian, that his practice is inconsistent with what he holds. Let me tell my brother plainly that his own positions in the Harbinger have placed him before large numbers of our brethren as either thus holding or thus inconsistent. I wish I could feel that his positions have done him injustice. Does Brother Pendleton hold that a man who is not a Christian, (I use the term strictly,) may commune? Suppose he does not. Yet does he hold that the unimmersed may commune? Suppose he does. Then that immersion is not necessary, according to him, to becoming a Christian, is intuitively evident. Or does he hold that a man is not a Christian without immersion, and that unless a Christian he may not commune? If so, let him plainly avow it; and this will exclude the unimmersed. I trust my brother will use no epithet to qualify the term Christian. Let him not say of a man, he may commune, if a Christian *in spirit*, or *in heart*, or *in deportment*; but let him plainly say, that he may not commune unless a *Christian*, or that he may commune without being one; also, that he is a Christian without immersion, or that he is not one without it. All men will then understand Brother Pendleton. But, perhaps, he will say that some of these points are of a nature so delicate, that he should shrink from deciding them on his own individual responsibility. Some of them are grave points, I grant, but then I well know that he has them all decided in his own mind. Let us have that decision.

Does Brother Pendleton take the position, and this is the position I understand him to take, that if a pious man, though not *strictly* a Christian, desires to commune with us, he may, on his own responsibility, do so; and we may not forbid him? I then reply, that, when he says of the man, he may commune if he sees fit, this is a mere opinion of Brother Pendleton, and is to be so held and so expressed, and that it is not a thing to be published to the world as something taught in Holy Writ. Let us not lose sight of our just and cherished distinction between matter of opinion and matter of faith.

Again, I understand Brother Pendleton to hold that it is extremely indelicate, if not presumptuous, to think that all the pious unimmersed are not Christians. I have reason to know much of

my brother's kind heart, and clear head; and that it is hard for him when speaking from the former to pronounce any good man not a Christian. Let him, then, not be offended with me, if I tell him that when he speaks thus, he speaks from the heart alone, and not from the head. I am not insensible to his amiableness in this respect. But this is not a question to be decided by affection, or sympathy, or anything else, save the clear, hard light of the Bible. By it, and it only, must every man stand or fall. I then ask my brother, whether, in the light of this sacred test, even he can pronounce Martin Luther a Christian without an epithet—a Christian in the sense in which the term occurs in the Bible—a Christian in the sense in which he applies the term to his venerable father, the President of Bethany College? If he replies he can; I then ask him to make the world sensible that he consistently believes immersion necessary to becoming a Christian; or if he says he cannot; then let him say outright that Luther was not a Christian; and we shall deem him, though none the less kind, certainly the more consistent. To think that a pious man is not a Christian, hurts me no less than it hurts Brother Pendleton. But then I owe a stern duty to the teachings of Holy Writ, which I must meekly pay, though it cost me every feeling of my heart, and unchristianized all the world besides. I love a lofty charity which refuses to note all the little errors of frail humanity; but I love not less that sublime regard for the truth which is ready to immolate even earth rather than one jot, or one tittle thereof should fail. It is not that I love Luther less, but that I love truth more, which impels me to think him not a Christian. In affection for his memory, in admiration for his strong brain, his great heart, his devotion to truth, and his shining deeds, I claim to be the inferior not even of the accomplished Pendleton. Still, admiration of the great man on the one hand, shall never enfeeble my regard for the voice of truth which, on the other, asks my fealty and defense. When we have settled the question as to Luther, we shall have settled it as to all the pious unimmersed. Many of the preceding questions are put, not as implying that Brother is not, or does not hold what they embrace, but for the sake of setting doubtful points, or points of difference, in the strongest light before the reader.

That the foregoing positions are offensive to the pious unimmersed, that they render it the more difficult for us to come into profitable contact with them, I well know, and that they even seem to imply a feeling of self superiority on our part, I shall not deny. All this I sincerely regret. But I have long since learned that you never correct men's errors by seeming to treat them as not errors; and that it is the spirit and air with which you tell a

man he is wrong which give him offense, rather than the mere fact of telling him so. Let the unimmersed be told of their error with a spirit as sweet and kind as that in which you would address the wife of your bosom, but at the same time with a purpose as firm and uncompromising as that in which you would snatch the hand of your child from theft. To the spirit which brethren Pendleton and Errett would have us manifest to the pious unimmersed in the parties of the day, none can object; but that these brethren have, in claiming for these pious unimmersed the right to commune, put forth a position deeply injurious to the truth of Christ, I cannot but think. And if they imagine that this is said in a captious or fault-finding spirit, or in a spirit which would impeach them with groundless error, they know not the hand that pens these lines. Brother Pendleton is my steadfast friend, but that he has stained the pages of the *Harbinger* with an error, I as conscientiously believe as I believe him to be my friend. Should he call this bold, I will not deny it; should he think it said by the wrong person, it would hurt me; but should he feel that it is unkind, then are we at issue. But this he will not do; for Brother Pendleton is a candid man, and he loves candor in others.

It is proper to remark here, that Brother Pendleton has most distinctly reiterated his belief, that immersion is necessary to becoming a Christian, a reiteration in no case necessary with the writer of this; and that he has very clearly defined his claim for the pious unimmersed. But that his belief, and his claim are inconsistent is the precise point which strikes me with force; nor do I believe that even he can ever reconcile them. That they are inconsistent to his mind, I do not for a moment believe; for he is incapable of holding a known inconsistency; but that they are inconsistent to my mind, I am not ashamed to avow, however they may appear to others.

In the course of this discussion the word right, or an expression equivalent to it, is one of frequent occurrence. We speak of the right of a man to commune, and of our right to forbid him. This term needs qualification. It is one which it is extremely difficult to use without creating a false impression, or leading to a false conclusion. Indeed, it is hardly too much to say, that it is a dangerous term to use, especially in a question like the present. The following qualifications are submitted with deference: A man is viewed in the two-fold character of man and Christian. A man, as a Christian, has the right to perform an act, as an act of worship, only when it is expressly sanctioned by Holy Writ. What is not thus sanctioned he has no right to perform. He has no rights except such as he has derived from this source. It is on this ground we say that the unimmersed may not commune. The

Bible does not recognize the unimmersed as Christians; it hence grants them no rights as such. A man, as man, has the right to do—1st, Whatever is necessary to constitute him a Christian; he has the right to believe and to the use of all the means necessary to belief, the right to repent, and the right to be immersed, and none whose duty it is to immerse can forbid him, for two rights cannot conflict: 2d, Whatever is for his own well-being or that of others, and is not inconsistent with the Bible. Beyond these a man has no rights either as a man or as a Christian. Hence when I claim the right to forbid the unimmersed to commune, my claim has this extent only; that as a teacher of the truth I must tell him he has not the right to commune. This done, and I can proceed no further. If he still insists that he has the right to commune, and communes, I am clear. But in this case I would hand him neither the loaf nor the cup. He should take them for himself.

But I shall be told that in thus assuming to forbid the unimmersed to commune, I assume to decide the question whether he is or is not a Christian—a question which I have not the right to decide. I deny the charge and disclaim the right. The man tells me he is a believer, I accept it; he tells me he is penitent, I accept it; he tells me he is unimmersed, on this *the Bible* decides him to be out of the kingdom, not a Christian. I make no decision of my own, but simply accept the Bible's decision, and on this base my statement that the man has not the right to commune. But it may be insisted that I still virtually decide the question, since I assume to determine what the Bible decides. I grant it, and reply that I am not to be blamed on that account. Every man does precisely the same, and could not do less if he would.

But I shall be asked, since it is conceded that there are Christians among the parties of the day, whether I would exclude them from communion? I reply, I would exclude no man from communion who is a Christian, but every man who is not. A Christian man is a member of the body of Christ and my brother, and I would commune with him in a loving spirit though I met him in the vilest sinks of Rome. Hell can rear no barriers so high, nor sin dig ditches so deep and foul, as to shut out from my fellowship him whom Christ has washed in his own blood. And though I admired a man with my whole strength, and loved him as my own flesh, and even wept over his deficiencies as feelingly as a mother weeps over the deformity of her babe, yet would I not "eat" with him, unless he was of the "one body." But when I concede that there are Christians amongst the parties of the day, let me not be accused of concealment. I recognize no human being as a Christian who is not immersed. Men may call this by what name they see fit, it moves me not. It is my faith: if

wrong, let the world reject it—if right, let the world take heed. But should even a Christian propose to commune with me as a Papist, or as a partisan of any kind, I should certainly decline his offer. To be accepted, the proposition would have to be made by him simply as a Christian, and in no other character or capacity.

The inconsistency of the Baptists in recognizing the unimmersed as Christians, and yet refusing to commune with them, glares even on the mind of a half idiot, from very shallowness. No sort of defense can be made for it. While their course in declining to commune with the other immersed, who are their peers both in life and spirit, must be pronounced intensely bigoted. I could never be so unjust to my common sense, to say nothing of the truth, as to fall into the inconsistency of the Baptists. If a man be a Christian, that is enough for me; I am ready to commune with him. In error he may be in some points, but this shall not cause me to reject him. Yet I should delight to see the day come when the Baptists would relax a little their austere and unhallowed rules on this point, and when we and they at least should enjoy the pleasure of cultivating more fraternal relations over the loaf and cup. I am not ashamed to avow that I even seek this; not because I covet the approbation and caresses of the Baptists, but for far worthier reasons—I seek it because it is right in itself.

But perhaps the position will be taken, as I believe it has been pending the present discussion, that God has a "people" even in Babylon, and that since His, they therefore, though unimmersed, have the right to commune. I reply, that the conclusion does not follow from the premises. If all who are in Babylon are unimmersed, then God has no people in it, in the sense in which Christians are his people. He then has a people in it either in this sense, that though not Christians, they are a pious people and will be saved, since their not being Christians has resulted, not from willful disobedience or perverseness of heart, but from unavoidable darkness of mind; or in this, that they *would be* Christians if they had the chance, but not having it they cannot be. They have the disposition or ready will but not the opportunity. It was in this latter sense that the Lord had "much people" in Corinth, as he said to Paul: Acts 18, 10; or rather, in the city were many people *for* Him, as the passage ought to read. They were *for* Him, that is, ready to become His or about to become His, but at the time not His. This they were *yet to become*. The passage here, and that in Revelation 18, 4, are different. In Revelation it is "my people;" in Acts it is a people *for* me. In Corinth they were yet to become Christians, and hence did not pretend to be Christians, whereas in Babylon they pretend to

be Christians, or think they are Christians, and though not so, since they are a pious people, God accepts them as His, not because they are indeed Christians, but because they would be had they a chance. Still, neither in the one case were they Christians nor in the other are they. Consequently in the one case they had not, and in the other they have not the right to commune. For I lay it down as a position never to be gainsayed, that none but a Christian can commune. In the sense in which He had a people in Corinth, and in which He has a people in Babylon, I rejoice to think He still has thousands scattered over the world, and in the various parties of the day, on whose final happiness we, in our narrow calculations, are not reconing. On this ground alone have I hope for many of the pious whom I am still compelled in pain to regard as not Christians.

Here doubtless I shall be met with the assertion, that it is inconsistent to admit that a man may be saved, and yet deny that he can commune. I shall not deny a seeming inconsistency; but a real one I must certainly deny. If God saved none but Christians, the inconsistency would be real. But this is not the case. He saves many who are not Christians—saves them because they do the best they can in the circumstances which surround them. Yet the grounds on which he saves these are different from the grounds on which men become Christians; and hence are not the grounds on which persons may commune. The rules by which God judges some men, to save them, are not the rules by which we are to judge them, to let them commune. He as Lord may, in making a decision, take into the account what we dare not even think of. To be short, because we conjecture that God will save a certain character who is not a Christian, we are not to proceed to treat him as though entitled to all the privileges of Christians. We must be governed strictly by the law, and in no case presume to disregard it.

Near the commencement of the present controversy a question was raised as to the practice of our churches in the premises. A word on this is demanded. Our churches in the West, I am sorry to say, without an exception known to me, permit the unimmersed to commune. They do not, I grant, invite them to commune; and yet their language is so understood by the unimmersed. "Let a man examine himself," they say, "and so let him eat and drink." This the unimmersed construe thus; Let a man determine for himself whether he is or is not a Christian; and if he determines that he is, then let him eat. This is unjust to the truth, and not just to the unimmersed. The language was never designed to start the question—Is a man a Christian or is he not? No such thought was in the Apostles' mind. The following is the question

the language raises: Is a *Christian worthy* to eat and drink? And surely, that a Christian is or is not worthy, is a very different thing from the question, is a man a Christian or is he not? Our churches have thoughtlessly glided into this practice; thoughtfully and at length I trust they will abandon it. It has been deemed one of those indifferent or harmless things which, though unsanctioned by the Bible, may nevertheless be tolerated in the church. Yet all such unsanctioned usages must, in the end, prove a curse. Let all our preachers and overseers, when citing the preceding language, plainly tell their audiences to whom alone it applies, and the only question it was designed to raise. Then, and not before, shall we be free from the charge, often and with effect urged against us, of inconsistently communing with those whom we regard as not Christians.

In the outset of the current reformation, our motto was: *a thus saith the Lord, for every article of our faith, a precept or a precedent for all we do*. In the light of this cherished postulate, what defense can we plead for our act when we set down to commune with the unimmersed? Did Paul ever do it? Did Peter ever do it? or did either ever command or counsel it? Let us be most careful of this; that we take our practice strictly from the holy word of God; and that what it does not clearly sanction we neither do nor countenance. Then and only then shall we be safe.

I extremely regret the position taken prominently and chiefly by brethren Pendleton and Errett on this question. It will subject us to the charge of having abandoned, in the persons of eminent brethren, the foregoing cardinal principle, of inconsistency between what we preach and what we practice, and of being a divided people in sentiment. This was most unnecessary. Had these brethren published what they have said, avowedly as mere matter of opinion, no controversy could have risen thereon. But they have given to their utterances a far graver aspect than can be ascribed to mere opinion. Hence their position wears a serious air. I wish every thought they have penned on it were erased. Had I the age or the position to justify it, I should certainly request these brethren to reconsider the ground they have taken. But such request they might think impertinent, and therefore treat it cavalierly. Hence it is not made.

In the foregoing remarks I have cited nothing from the writings of the brethren named. My reasons for this are these: 1. All they have said has been long since read by all who will see this piece. 2. Brother Pendleton at least will not think me capable of intentionally misrepresenting him. Brother Errett does not know me so well, though I hope he has no reason to think differently; 3. If the foregoing statements misrepresent them or

their views, I wish the opportunity of publishing the correction from their own hands. The sense in which I understand their views is the sense in which their views are generally understood. But I am more than anxious that they shall afford me and many others the opportunity of understanding their views, as the expression, on their part, of mere matters of opinion. The controversy would then be at an end.

THE APOSTLE JOHN.—Imagination, properly speaking, is not found in the Epistles of John. They are full of heart, of practical suggestion, of intuitive insight, and of grave, yet tender dignity. You see the aged and venerable saint seated among his spiritual children, and pouring out his rich simplicities of thought and feeling, while a tear now and then steals down his cheek. That passion for Christ, which was in John as well as in Paul, appears in the form of tranquil expectation. We shall soon see him *as he is*! The orator is seen as he is, when he has shot his soul into his entire audience, and is ruling them like himself. The warrior appears as he is, when lifting up his far-seen finger of command, and leading on the charge. The poet is seen as he is, when the fine phrenzy of inspiration is in his eye. So Jesus shall be seen as he is, when he comes garlanded and girt for the judgment; and when, blessed thought, his people shall be *like him*, for the first look of that wonderful face of His shall complete and eternize the begun similitude, and the angelic hosts, perceiving the resemblance, seeing millions upon millions of reflected Christs, shall take up the cry, "open ye the gates, that the righteous nation may enter in."—*Gilfillan*.

If we seriously consider what religion is, we shall find the saying of the wise king Solomon to be unexceptionably true: *Her ways are ways of pleasantness, and all her paths are peace.*

Doth religion require anything of us more than that we live *soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world*? Now what, I pray, can be more pleasant or peaceful than these? Temperance is always at leisure, luxury always in a hurry; the latter weakens the body, and pollutes the soul; the former is the sanctity, purity, and sound state of both. It is one of Epicurus' fixed maxims, "That life can never be pleasant without virtue."—*Leighton*.

THE FIRST BEATITUDE.

"Blessed are the poor in Spirit, for theirs is the Kingdom of Heaven."

SUCH is the first sentence in the greatest speech ever uttered. That it has a significance of no common magnitude, we can well believe. Elsewhere in this number will be found a short criticism setting forth what we conceive to be its true meaning; though, in one view, no such criticism is needed. The sentence resembles, in one respect, certain familiar words; such as, yes, no, etc. It is very difficult to form a precise and happy definition of them; and with those who daily use them, this is not necessary. Long before the tardy lexicographer has constructed his definition, have they conveyed to the mind their full import. And so with the first beatitude. Long ere the plodding exegete has completed his criticism, has it parted from its whole meaning to the soul. To the man who has profoundly studied his spiritual wants, the deep, conscious hungerings of the inner man, it needs no explanation. Its meaning flashes on the mind like an intuition. *To be poor in spirit* is something we *feel*, not something we deduce from slow, philological processes. We feel it as we feel an instinct; and carry it as we carry the eternal consciousness of our identity. Were I called upon to name that feeling of the human heart, which, more than all others besides, facilitates the spread of Christianity among men, I should not for a moment hesitate to name feeling poor in spirit. And were I called upon, in like manner, to name the feeling which, more than every other besides, retards the spread of the Gospel, I should certainly name feeling not poor in spirit. Until men can be rendered deeply sensible of this feeling, until it pervades them like the love of life, it is positively idle to preach to them the Gospel. As well might you try, by preaching to it, to make a vulture, gorged with the flesh of some hapless lamb, feel the pain of hunger, as to try, by preaching to them, to make men feel their need of Christ, until they have first keenly experienced what it is to be poor in spirit. But when once they have truly experienced this, when they have realized its whole meaning, then it is no more trouble to move them to good than it is for the particles of the air to float among each other. We preach a theory of conversion, and it has its advantages, I grant; but could we make all men feel, truly feel, what it is to be poor in spirit, no longer would conversion be a subject for endless disputation, but a grand constantly recurring fact. It would then be the rule, non-conversion the rare exception; whereas, at present, the reverse is unhappily the case.

Unless I have mistaken the import of the first beatitude, it has its antithesis in a feeling of inner self-sufficiency—the most dangerous form spiritual pride can assume. Under the influence of this feeling the Gospel is either sneeringly rejected, or treated with haughty indifference, or accepted with cold ingratitude, as though it were nothing more than the payment of a debt due from God to man. In this feeling love cannot grow; and even faith becomes mechanical and dry. It is the Sahara of the human breast, the desolate spot of the heart, from which no noble sentiments ever spring, and where all tender sympathies perish. To be not poor in spirit is the most damning disease sin has left in human nature. It is the impassable gulf between God and man—the mete which even mercy never reaches. Even God cannot look on the man who is not poor in spirit, who has lifted himself on high in his presence, save with mingled detestation and pity. On every fallen spirit in hell, is the fate of all such men, at this moment, written in the following line:

“Proud bird of the mountain thy plume shall be torn.”

And again: “Behold, I am against thee, O though most proud, saith the Lord God of Hosts; for thy day is come, the time that I will visit thee. And the most proud shall stumble and fall, and none shall raise him up; and I will kindle a fire in his cities, and it shall devour all round about him.”

But it will serve to place the first beatitude in a more advantageous light before us, if we note a little the circumstances which attended its first delivery. Who then composed the audience? The proudest people on earth; and the people who had the best reason to be proud. They were Israelites of the seed of Abraham; so that if others had reason to be proud, they more. No nation ever boasted an ancestry such as they boasted. No records of time furnished so illustrious an instance of unstaggering faith in God as did the life of their great progenitor; and, in return for it, never was mortal honored of Heaven as was he. Who ever wrote law like Moses? Who ever sang songs like David? Who ever breathed prophetic strains so lofty as Isaiah? Who ever poured forth laments so touching as Jeremiah? And where was ever seer like Daniel? What other nation had God ever brought out of the house of bondage, on eagles wings, as he had his own chosen heritage? Whom had he ever fed on angel's food save the stock of Jacob? Where was the nation that could point to a priesthood such as descended from Aaron? and who, of all the children of men possessed a system of religion such as he administered? Horeb had been the foundery of its wondrous types; and its long, mystic shadows still lay on the nation like dreams of enchantment, pointing to grand events far lying in the future.

Never had sunlight fallen on a structure so gorgeous as the house Solomon built for God; and never city boasted wealth and culture such as graced the city of the great King. No land ever flowed with milk and honey like the goodly land where God had set his people down; no clouds so kind as those which gave it the early and the latter rain; and never did sky so bland and starry hang over any spot, as hung over the one of which God said, I will give it thee.

All these, and many more, were circumstances well calculated to make the children of Israel proud in spirit, and not poor. Besides, at the time when the Saviour delivered the first beatitude, they had tarnished their glorious religion by crude traditions; so that its light had faded to a feeble glimmer, and its voice died to an unheeded lull. And just as the law and the prophets lost their power over the great heart of the nation, their spirits rose high and rioted in pride. In a mood like this had they collected on the brow of a little mountain, close perhaps to Capernaum, in the presence of Him who was meek and lowly in spirit. He deemed it a fitting time to speak to his kindred according to the flesh. But no apologetic and classic prologue prefaces that speech. Its first weighty sentence bursts upon the world like its author, grand, peculiar, and teeming with divine sense. Around him sat ostentatious, self-important Pharisees; plodding, conceited Scribes; cold haughty, affluent Sadducees; jealous, crafty Herodians; and still nearer his person, an elect little group of humble men who had left all to follow him. These eyed him with wonder and affection; those, with suspicion and hate. All is silent until broken by the first beatitude: "*Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the Kingdom of Heaven.*" Such is the calm, deep-meaning commencement of the master speech of earth. *Blessed are the poor in spirit*—let that be repeated. Who responds? Not the Pharisee, not the Scribe, not the Sadducee, not the Herodian. Who responds? Mercy grant, gentle reader, that at least it may be you.

Thus, in his first public sentence, the Saviour lays the axe keen and sharp at the very root of all spiritual pride. The soul, hungry and poor, he summons into his presence; and over it in this mood pronounces its glorious recompense—*thine is the Kingdom of Heaven*. Not only does He turn away thought from the world with its wealth and pride; but even from the flesh and its pride he turns it away. *Christianity begins in the spirit*. Hence to this he directs our thought. The spirit is the imperishable part; the gem which forever glows in its frail casket. Man's wealth is in his soul; this lost, and all is gone. "For what is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?" Not only does the Saviour

turn our thoughts to the inner man; but with a single master-stroke sets before us in the boldest light the most needed frame or mood thereof. The spirit must be *poor*—not mean, not impoverished as to thought, culture, or talent; but poor in the sight of God; not proud, not self-sufficient, but deeply and consciously in need of the “true riches,” and forever lost without them. This poverty is wealth; this mood, life.

How unwelcomely must this beatitude have fallen upon many a proud heart in the audience that first heard it! If to them its author was a “root” out of dry ground; if in Him was no “beauty that they should desire Him;” we can well imagine the bitterness with which they first heard His first searching sentence. It went to the soul like a refiners fire, and scarcely less painfully. Yet on many a spirit in that audience deliciously fell that sentence. Bruised reeds were there, broken and contrite hearts; those whose bosoms death had left empty indeed and poor; those off whose spirits the weight of life-long grief and want had never once been lifted; pale cheeks were there, and wasted age. When the calm, sweet look of the Saviour fell on them, and he said: “Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the Kingdom of Heaven,” then, out of those human wrecks, out of the ashes of extinguished hopes, arose aspirations reaching far beyond the ills of time. It was utterances like this which gathered about the Saviour’s form those trusting hearts that never forgot to love Him while here, nor ceased to mourn for Him when gone—hearts that ever struggled to be among them to whom He said: “I will come and take you to myself.” And these are still the utterances which, like mysterious magnets, collect the pure of earth together, and weld them forever in one. They are the rills from the fountain of life, which fertilize the arid wastes of humanity and cause them to blossom as the rose. It is not the history of the Bible, nor its law, nor its logic, nor its poetry, nor even the enchanting future it describes, that can touch the heart and wake its deep, latent love like sayings such as the first beatitude.

In all lands and ages the danger has existed that conversion to Christ may be too intellectual, and hence too mechanical, as well as too purely the result of sympathy and excitement. Safety lies in shunning both these extremes. But if there be any one feeling or element which can, in excess, enter into conversion, we must think it the feeling described in the first beatitude. A man cannot be so poor in spirit or feel it so keenly as to vitiate his conversion. Nay, I should rather think the measure in which he is sensible of this feeling, the truest test of the acceptableness of his conversion with God. At least let no man think that he can turn to Christ without it. God can no more suffer pride of spirit in

his presence than he can pollution. It is true of men's souls more than of their bodies that God fills the hungry with good things, but sends the rich away empty. While on earth the voice of the hungry poor was a voice that never rang unheeded in the Saviour's ear; and now that he sits at the right hand of the Majesty on High, no voice ever comes up from the hungry in spirit which returns empty from Him. The cherubim and the seraphim may stand near Him, and peal after peal of their sublime anthems may fill his ear, seeming to hush all other sounds, but the gentlest whisper from the poor in spirit on earth awakes a response in Him. Bless the Lord, O my soul; and all that is within me bless His holy name.

It is poverty which brings the beggar to our door for bread; and want in some of its various forms, which more than any thing else unites the human family into communities, social, political, and other kinds. In like manner, if all Christians felt, as all should feel, what it is to be truly poor in spirit, it would have the effect to cause them to flock together into the "one body" far more eagerly than they now do, and would form one of the holiest and strongest cements in the family of God. Nothing makes us feel so dependent upon Christ as to be poor in spirit indeed; and hardly less, were we all really so, would we feel our dependence upon one another. Worldly wealth lays many broad acres between family and family here; but pride of spirit lays distances more impassable still. Not more naturally does the hungry infant seek its mother's breast, than do the sincerely poor in spirit seek each other's help.

Even partyism plants its seeds and grows its roots in pride of spirit more than in any thing else. It is the teeming soil of heresies. Break it down and in its stead let all become, not in form, but in fact, poor in spirit, and divisions and estrangements among the children of God must cease. How could it be otherwise? A common feeling is a common nature; and despite a thousand parting tendencies, keeps us one.

Mark earth's truly poor man. In him all pride, save the pride of honor, has perished; his spirit is not brittle, but lithe; not harsh, but gentle; it wears no fiery edge, and carries no venomous prickles; his voice is low and sad, his look meek and melancholy—such is earth's poor man. I never see him that he does not nearly break my heart; yet I thank God for him. But for him we should never have had the word poor, and but for that word, never the first beatitude, and but for the first beatitude, never the deep insight into the spirit's most needed feeling which it has given us, and but for that insight we had never been Christians. Finally: The Saviour himself was the noblest exemplification of his

own beatitude; and what else than his humble imitators should all his disciples be? He was a man of sorrow and acquainted with grief; and these grow not in inner pride. He knew what it is to groan within and to weep; and these spring only from a spirit poor indeed. That we may all live to learn what it is to be poor in spirit, and learn to live poor in spirit, is the best wish with which I can close these remarks on the first beatitude.

A COUNTRY SUNDAY.—I am always very well pleased with a country Sunday; and think, if keeping holy the seventh day were only a human institution, it would be the best method that could have been thought of for the polishing and civilizing of mankind. It is certain the country people would soon degenerate into a kind of savages and barbarians, were there not such frequent returns of a stated time, in which the whole village meet together with their best faces, and in their cleanliest habits, to converse with one another upon indifferent subjects, hear their duties explained to them, and join together in adoration of the Supreme Being. Sunday clears away the rust of the whole week, not only as it refreshes in their minds the notions of religion, but as it puts both the sexes upon appearing in their most agreeable forms, and exerting all such qualities as are apt to give them a figure in the eye of the village. A country fellow distinguishes himself as much in the church-yard, as a citizen does upon the change, the whole parish politics being generally discussed in that place either after sermon or before the bell rings.—*Spectator*.

ALL REVEALED THAT SHOULD BE KNOWN.—It is wiser and safer as well as more pious and humble, and more agreeable to Christian truth to confess, that, of the mysteries which have been so boldly discussed by many who *acknowledge them to be unfathomable*, we know nothing beyond the faint and indistinct revelations of Scripture; and that if it had been possible, and proper, and designed that we should know *more* of such matters, more would have been *there* revealed.—*Whately*.

WHAT WE THINK OF.—We think, indeed, to a considerable extent, by means of names, but what we think of, are the things called by those names; and there cannot be a greater error than to imagine that thought can be carried on with nothing in our mind but names, or that we can make the names think for us.—*Mill*.

HUMAN CREEDS AS TESTS OF TRUTH MAKE VOID THE WORD OF GOD.

THE religious corruptions which have been propagated under the sanctions of Christianity were distinctly foreseen by the Holy Spirit, who was sent from heaven to advocate the claims of Messiah, the Son of God. The Apostles announced a grand apostasy or defection from the simple Gospel which they preached and elaborated into perfect development. The great anti-christian power was fittingly styled the *Man of sin*. The characteristic features of this power are described most graphically by the Apostle Paul: "Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God. Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things? And now ye know what withholdeth that he might be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way. And then shall that Wicked One be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming: even him, whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders, and with all deceiveableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of truth, that they might be saved."*

This is a remarkable prediction; and it deserves to be profoundly studied by all who desire to understand the present position and bearing of the modern Christian profession. The striking characteristics of the passage are the following, to-wit:

1. He, the man of sin, was to rise to power by unobserved degrees—was to come forward stealthily and sliily. "The secret of iniquity already inwardly works."

2. He could not be manifested till the old Pagan power should be dethroned. Political and Ecclesiastical power was essential conditions for the full development of the apostasy.

3. He was to exalt himself above all that is called a God—or an object of worship. The term God here may mean, and doubtless does mean, a king or magistrate; and the man of sin was to exalt himself above them. That the Popes of Rome, not only in their titles, such as, "Holy Father," "Universal Father," "Sovereign

* 2 Thes., ii : 2-10.

Pontiff," "Supreme Head of the Church on Earth," "Vicar of Christ," "Infallible One," "Lieutenant of Christ," "Lord of Lords," and "Lord God the Pope," claimed what no king or magistrate ever claimed, but in their *acts* arrogated an authority never exercised by the head of any earthly government, is matter of history too well established to need proof.

4. He sits in the temple of God. He is not the inventor of a new religion, nor is he an aspiring Infidel, Jew or Gentile, but a *professed* Christian; and he sits in the temple or church of God, holding a power that makes him supreme.

5. He shows himself to be a god. He claims to reign for God and to be in God's stead, and appropriates to himself honors that can only be properly given to the Supreme Being.

6. He is called the "Wicked" or **LAWLESS ONE**. Daniel, in speaking of the same anti-christian power, represents it as changing *times and laws*. The man of sin was to change or modify laws and ordinances, especially in Christianity—thus raising a grand superstructure or system of corrupted Christianity, of which he is the head and vital spirit.

7. The manner of the decline and destruction of this formidable power is deserving attention. "Whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of His mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of His coming." "The spirit of His mouth" points out the "sword of the spirit," which is the word of God, as the instrument, by the circulation and reading of which men's minds would be enlightened, and gradually turned away from this false head of Christianity. He declines slowly, but surely, from a *chronic* consumption.

8. The coming of the man of sin was like the insidious approaches and assumptions of Satan, with wonders, and lying or false miracles, designed to deceive men, and by this means to make them believe that the blasphemous assumptions of this *lawless one* were supported by supernatural attestations. This attribute consists in *pretended miracles*.

The foregoing meagre outline of the characteristics of the man of sin is sufficient to enable us to identify the Roman Catholic church as the fulfillment of the prediction. This is the only verification of the prophecy that history affords; and in the structure and history of the Papacy, the prophecy is accomplished in the most striking manner.

In Roman Catholicism we have the genus of religious corruptions, under the mediatorial reign of the Lord Jesus Christ. We may naturally look for species and individuals under this genus, just as the radical idea or fundamental fact of the great defection may

find peculiarity of feature in different minds, and circumstances which modify its development.

It is not necessary that every religious error shall happen within the pale of the Romish church in order to its being a true feature of the countenance of the man of sin. It is enough that any theory of Christianity be substituted for Christianity—that a given system be not identical with the Apostles' doctrine, and that it be propagated under the sanctions of the word of God. All such religions are legitimate parts and parcels of the original apostasy or falling away from the true gospel. They are growths from the same parent stock. They differ from Rome, and from each other as the individual differs from the species; but the fact that identifies them with the genus Apostasy, is this—*They are not Christianity, but aberrations from it. They are fallings away.*

The fundamental fact in the apostasy is departure from Apostolic faith and practice. This makes Rome the man of sin. We tell the Papist that for much of his faith and practice there is no precedent, example, or authority, in the word of God. This is the chief issue—the whole issue, in a single generalization, between the Protestant and the Catholic. The Catholic grants the Protestant objection. Rome does not claim the authority of the written word of God for much of her faith and practice. She appeals to the authority of tradition. This is the true state of the question between the parties. Upon this question another arises—Is the Bible alone the only rule of faith and practice? The Protestant affirms, the Catholic denies. Rome cannot admit the Bible to be the only rule of faith, for in making this admission, all that constitutes her essential characteristics as the original apostasy, would stand confessed before men, without one justifying argument in its defense. The admission would be the death of Romanism. She must not make it; she dares not make it, for her very existence is staked upon maintaining the contrary.

Rome acknowledges, however, that her Christianity is not identical with the Christianity of the written word of God. She has items of faith not *asserted* in the Scriptures, and practices not *commanded* by any inspired writer. There is an antagonism between her and the Bible. She feels this—confesses it—and carries it perpetually as a heavy burden. Hence her conduct towards the Holy Scriptures in every age, and country, has been most characteristic and peculiar. It has been in striking harmony with the felt incongruity there is between the Christianity of the Inspired Word, and the Christianity of the church. She has kept the Bible in *dead languages* as much as possible, and to the utmost of her power prevented its being read by the laity, and the world. This fact is full of tremendous meaning. The first

translator of the Bible into English, the immortal Tyndale, fell a martyr to Roman vengeance, and expired in the flames. That an institution should bear such hatred to a book as to burn a man to death for translating it, carries on its face a volume of significance which no art of cunning Priests can long hide from the world's eyes. And the fact of Tyndale's martyrdom is one of a numerous class that might be cited, all going to show that Rome's opposition to the wide-spread circulation of the Holy Scriptures grows out of her consciousness of the fact that there is an irreconcilable antagonism between the Bible and the church. She has persecuted every effort on the part of every one to give the Bible to the world, where she had the power to do it; and it is a well known fact that her own members are, in the mass, prohibited from reading the Holy Scriptures.

Let us put these two facts together. 1st. The concession of Rome that much of her faith and practice is unauthorized by the Bible; and 2d. Her persecuting, martyring opposition to the circulation of the Scriptures among the people. These two facts furnish a *confession*, on the part of Rome, that she has *departed* from original Christianity, and is, in fact, the central organized anti-christian power of the Prophets.

The flimsy argument from tradition is a striking corroborative testimony to our conclusion. That important, essential parts of man's redemption—items both of faith and practice—should have been left as *traditions* in the church, to float from age to age over the mighty sweep of time, is next to impossible as an abstract proposition. But when we take into consideration the fact that we do actually possess a written revelation, and that the redemption of man is the grand subject of the Bible, the supposition that there is any deficiency in the written word, especially of an essential character, increases in improbability; but when we are told that this deficiency was to be supplied by the uncertain channel of tradition, a man must relinquish and renounce his reason in order to believe it. The appeal to tradition is a trick—and though it has worked well in ages and populations of ignorance, yet we think that even the trick itself is clumsy, and carries in itself the signs of its detection and exposure. And, mark it, Rome will find in the progress of the human family, that this plea was the very worst that could have been invented; and that it absolutely strikes a death-blow at her heart which no strength nor skill can divert. Her pretended miracles, her solemn mysteries, her appeal to vague and uncertain traditions; putting them upon an equal ground of authority with the written word of God; her admission that much of her faith and practice are unauthorized by the Holy Scriptures, and her deadly opposition to

the general circulation of the Bible among men, clearly point her out as the apostate and son of perdition or ruin, who, like the traitor Judas, was the subject of prophecy. These facts constitute her disguised confession, and open acknowledgement of the conclusion to which half of the civilized world have arrived from reading the Papal history, and the Prophets, that she is the true and veritable man of sin—the developed and organized apostasy of New Testament prediction.

What then constitutes the actual departure of Catholicism from original Christianity? This is an important inquiry. To enumerate the items of faith and practice for which there is no Divine warrant in the word of God, and which Rome maintains as parts of Christianity on other than Bible authority, while it would present the *facts* of the apostasy, would not indicate and develop the *principle* to which they belong. It is highly important that these facts should be definitely referred to the general principle out of which they sprang, and which is their sub-foundation, or the great aorta of life to the entire body of the apostate church.

In order to be successful in this investigation it is necessary to pause, for a moment, and to contemplate the subject-matter of the faith of the First Christian Church, and the authority on which it rested. The matter of the original faith was the matter of the Gospel itself. Men believed the *Gospel of Christ*—and on this faith, and no other, they became Christians. This will not be denied. In so far as the Gospel consists of literal *facts*, as distinguished from moral truths or principles, they are the *things* that God has done for our ruined world, in order to save it. Here it will be perceived that the mind approaches directly to the things done on the part of Heaven for our redemption. God commands the sinner to believe that *He* has done for him the things set forth in the Bible; and solemnly threatens him with eternal condemnation if he does not believe. The general proposition, on which the separate facts and *truths* of Christianity depend is, that Jesus of Nazareth is the Christ of the Old Testament prophets. The Messiahship is emphatically the grand proposition of the four Evangelical histories. If Jesus be the Christ, the Son of the Living God, then every fact recorded of Him is true; and every utterance of His is an oracle. If he be not the Christ, then the Christianity founded upon it is false. The Messiahship of Jesus is the highest generalization in Christianity. The proof of the Messiahship may be accurately viewed under three heads, to-wit: 1. Ancient Prophecy, respecting the character and life of the Messiah; 2. The miracles wrought by the Christ, in attestation of his peculiar claim to be the Son of God; 3. The descent and gifts of the Holy Spirit to the Apostles—gifts to perform various and stupendous miracles in proof or con-

firmation of the Gospel which they preached being the Gospel of the true Messiah. The testimonies developed under these several classifications absolutely prove both the Messiahship and the separate facts of the Gospel—the death and resurrection of the Christ. Perhaps it ought to be added that these facts had the immediate sense-perception of the original witnesses for their support.

Therefore the matter of faith, the things to be believed, in order to salvation, are supported, proved, and demonstrated by Divine evidence or testimony, prophecy and miracle. No living man was ever required of God to believe any fact or truth, as it respects redemption, but upon the testimony of prophecy and miracle. The faith, in the style of the New Testament writers, or the things essential to be believed, are precisely those which the eternal God has proved to be true by his own indisputable testimony. This position, which cannot be disputed by any intelligent Protestant, and which cannot be successfully opposed by any advocate of Rome, clearly points out the inspired volume as containing the only rule of faith; or in other words, no man is bound to believe or practice any thing that is not *asserted* and positively commanded in the Holy Scriptures. If any thing else is believed, it must be held upon other evidence than miracle and prophecy, which are the Divine proofs of the original Gospel. This clearly cuts the roots of *tradition* as authoritative in matters of religious faith and practice. In the development of Christianity, the Apostles spoke as they were moved by the Holy Spirit. The evangelical facts, beginning with the very first, the incarnation, the conception of a virgin by the power of God, the birth, the death, the resurrection, the ascension, and coronation of Jesus, together with the supernatural descent of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, as well as his gifts richly distributed to the Apostles, and by them to others, were subjects of ancient prophecy, and were confirmed by miracle. Prophecy and miracle are God's sign-manual to the truth of the Gospel. Where this hand writing, this Divine security and infallible warrant and demonstration is wanting, no man is under any obligation to believe. Its absence is a sure sign of an *apocryphal* Gospel. The Messiahship being proved by God's testimony, all the commands, promises, and threatenings of the Bible rest upon Divine *authority*, and on this ground alone are to be held. This is the authority on which Christianity claims the faith and obedience of the world.

We are now prepared to develop the original apostasy in its facts and the great principle that underlies them. Let us take the supremacy of the Pope and the mass. These will serve as an illustration. Rome makes these matters of faith, and denounces eternal damnation upon all who do not embrace them. And yet

they are not among the contents of the inspired books. Where, in the Old Testament are they the subject of prophecy? And where was any miracle wrought to establish them? To ask these questions is to obtain a negative reply to them from all intelligent Bible students, whose minds are not trammelled by human authority and sectarian bias. Not one of the peculiar tenets of Rome, which make her Rome, or distinguish her in her faith and practice from the Apostolic church, were the subject of prophecy, or confirmed to men through the Apostles. They are neither asserted nor commanded in the New Testament Scriptures. They are unapostolic, having no Divine claim upon any man's faith and obedience, because they are unsupported by the Divine Testimony, prophecy and miracle. They are not parts of Christianity, but are spurious facts, innovations, or corruptions, and belong to a false system of religion. God is not their author, and commands no one to receive them; but by their absence from His word, warns all men against them, *as His*.

The items of faith and practice of Rome, not *asserted* and commanded in the word of God—and these constitute Popery—when written or arranged in the mind, formed a *new symbol* of faith—a genuine *human* creed—distinct from the word of God, which is the Divine symbol of faith presented to mankind by the Apostles. The Apostles proclaimed the faith of the Gospel, and confirmed it by miracle. They set it forth in language suggested or given them by the Holy Spirit. Their inspired writings, together with the four Evangelical histories, make a true and veritable *symbol* of the true faith. This is a creed or symbol in the true sense of the word. In holding or believing this inspired symbol, the very Gospel itself is believed.

The principle of the apostasy is the *rejection* of this Divine symbol, the word of God, as the only rule of faith. The *matter* of the *apostasy* consists of every thing that is introduced for faith, that is not asserted and commanded in the Divine word. Whatever is thus introduced, becomes both a *new* symbol of faith, and a true *apostasy*, or falling away from the original Gospel. The creed or symbol is something distinct from the Divine symbol or written word of God; and the matter of the new symbol is wholly distinct and separate from that of the old. The new symbol, in itself, is a purely human production, and the matter of it is also human, unsupported by a particle of Divine testimony. The human creed displaces the Divine symbol of faith, and takes its place. It is a test of religious truth, and gathers to itself the authority which originally belonged to the Holy Scriptures. The matter of the human creed displaces the matter of the word of God, and takes its place, clothed with the authority of oracles over the human

mind. Thus the word of God is made void or of no effect by the operation of the principle and the facts of the apostasy.

The principle of making a symbol of faith other than the simple word of God is the primal conception, and the last fact in the analysis of the original apostasy. From the day this was done to the present moment, Christianity has been mutilated, coupled with lies and with mere human authority, employed as an instrument for ambition, selfishness, and rapacity; and society convulsed with quarrels, and divided by issues falsely called parts and parcels of the Gospel of Christ. The apostasy has mingled itself with the Christian profession for ages. The history of the church is a disgusting scenic representation of the worst and most degraded human passion, with here and there a pure character, struggling against a general corruption. The heart grows sick of reading the records of vice clothed in the dress of Christianity. The pious mind becomes disgusted with reading the annals of churches as bloody and corrupt as the kingdoms and empires, the kings and warriors of the world. And why is it that the annals of the church are thus stained? Why is it that a Gospel so pure as that in the Holy Scriptures, should, for ages, in its historic development and progress in human character, present so black and so unworthy a picture? There can be but one true answer given to these formidable questions, and that is, *The history of the church is not the history of apostolic Christianity, but the history of the grand apostasy so plainly announced by the inspired Prophets of the Bible.* Here is the secret why the annals of church history are dark and bloody, why vice and crime have predominated over the social virtues and the stern moral principles that ought to distinguish the Christian profession. A new symbol and new matter, really constituted a new system—a modified and corrupted Gospel or Christianity, held up to the world under the sanctions of the Apostles' Gospel, and this has wrought out its own image and stamped its own spirit forever in the fearful pages of ecclesiastical history. The church of Rome is this original form of corruption and apostasy. She is its great practical exemplar. But her example appears to have struck the heart of the world with a sort of fascination; for new symbols of faith became the order of long and dreary centuries, and the world became filled with individual forms of the original Defection, in jarring, hostile, and persecuting sects, organized upon new symbols of faith—that is, upon *human creeds.* *Sectarianism* is the apostasy in its several species and varieties. They are not Christianity, but special developments under one great genus—Rome—or apostasy. The fashion has been to stigmatize Rome as the apostasy, and to confine all the developments of the Defection to the bosom of that one church. This is but a

partial view—an imperfect classification of facts. Every sect, in the true import of the term, is but a section of the great city of Babylon—a specific Rome—an individual feature of the great error involved in the original departure from the Divine Christianity of the word of God. Such is believed to be a faithful analysis of the apostasy in its principle and matter.

That Rome has added spurious facts and commandments to the word of God is the conviction of the entire Protestant world. No Protestant will hesitate to admit our analysis of the apostasy, so far as the Romish church is concerned. But whether the principle will be admitted as forbidding the holding of a human creed at all, is another matter. This we know will not be admitted by the sects whose very existence depends upon these unauthorized instruments. It is hard to get a man to see his own wrong-doing, and it is often a harder task to get him to confess it. Human creeds have been the order of the day so long, they are so interwoven with the popular idea of the church and its wants, that thousands feel for them a veneration equal to that which they feel for the Bible itself, and cannot see how Christianity can exist and be truly promulgated without them. Although the Bible and creeds are two distinct things, that by no means imply each other, or co-existed from the beginning, yet the great mass of the people contemplate the complex idea as a unit. This arises from custom and habit. And hence, to oppose human creeds is equal to opposing the Bible or Christianity, in the common esteem of the sectarian world. The effect of error is to blind the mind. The spiritual sight perishes under the prevalence of false systems and false reasonings. That Protestant sects should worship human creeds as bonds of union, is just as natural as it is for a good Papist to enter the confessional, or a Mussulman to hate a Christian. It is not to be expected that a sectarian will see and admit the principle of the unlawfulness of human creeds, although he may easily be made to see that the introduction of a particular human creed constitutes the fundamental fact of the grand apostasy. The principle is more difficult to perceive as applicable to any and all symbols of this sort; and the difficulty is increased a hundred fold by the causes already enumerated.

The grand issue between original Christianity and the whole sectarian rank and file, is the *creed question*. Every other issue is subordinate to this. So long as these human symbols obtain at all, as tests of truth, the questions that divide different parties never can be settled. They are insoluble problems, and the alienations which grow out of them are as immortal as man. They will penetrate each future generation, and produce the same bitter fruit as they have in the past and present. Now a question of

transcendent importance and untold interest arises here, to-wit: Are these religious divisions, feuds, hatreds, and irreconcilable contradictions and antagonisms to last forever? Is the spirit of universal brotherhood and harmony so plainly taught in the inspired Christianity never to be realized among the followers of Christ? Is the Divine Gospel destitute of plain and satisfactory teaching? Is it but a thorny theme for endless dispute and debate? Does it settle nothing, but leave the speculative spirit to construct, as best it can, all that is worthy of being called Christianity? These are grave questions. They lie at the very foundation of the triumph of the Gospel over men's unbelief, and involve also the civil and political happiness of States and Empires. They are worthy the supreme attention of the statesman and philanthropist, as well as the Christian teacher. And the mind that will not entertain them is wanting in a true living interest in the growth and triumph of peace on earth and good will among men.

We rejoice that the perception of truth on this great subject is multiplied in hundreds of thousands of living men and women; and that the number is being daily increased. That the introduction of any human symbol or creed to mould the faith of men is a rank apostasy—a falling away from the faith once delivered to the Saints—is seen and appreciated by a host of men possessing sound minds and pure hearts; and they are supporting this proposition with a power and success that have united upon them the consolidated opposition of the sects, as upon a common foe. The destiny of every variety of the original apostasy is staked on the issues of this grand contest. We do not even hesitate to affirm that the destiny of the Gospel of Christ is involved in this great issue. For the kingdom of Heaven would waste and finally perish from eternal divisions and strifes. No kingdom divided against itself can stand. This is a universal principle applicable to every social state in the universe. There has not been, since the days of Christ and the Apostles, so important and glorious a contest as that between the Current Reformation and the religious world. And, as before remarked, the *creed question* contains the whole issue, in a single generalization. The question is, shall the original Divine symbol of faith—the word of God—be the only rule of faith, or shall human symbols take its place practically? This is the question. The issue is between the old Christianity and the great Apostasy, developed in many forms, and varieties, but each one springing out of a human creed—and therefore all embraced in a single generalization. In this contest we stand in the same relation to *all parties*—Romish and Protestant. We are morally compelled to wage an uncompromising war upon all human creeds, as new religions, destitute of Divine warrant, and whose opera-

tion makes void the word of God. Let us proceed with the argument.

It is contended that Protestant orthodox creeds do not, like that of Rome, introduce any false fact into Christianity as an item of faith; and hence that they are not apostasies. These symbols profess to present the elementary parts of Christianity, and, by consequence, Christianity itself. This is a high claim indeed—equal to that of the word of God; for no book, not even the Bible, can do *more* than present, in human speech, the Gospel of Jesus Christ. If it is meant that Protestant creeds do not interpolate facts, like Popish miracles, it is conceded. But these creeds do present propositions unknown to the Scriptures. The additions to the word of God in them are numerous; but these are of an intellectual or speculative kind. In other words, these creeds are theoretical views of Christianity. They are attempts to present Christianity, in human scientific formulas. This is confessed by their advocates. But we insist that this is not the Divine formula in which Christianity was originally enunciated, and is, therefore, an apostasy or falling away from the old symbol of faith. The formula being a new one, and purely human, it can never claim equality with the word of God. Aside even from any thing a human creed may contain, we condemn it *per se*. It is a substitute for the Bible in the same sense in which the creed of Popery is a substitute. It is a remove from the word of God. It is exchanging the symbol of faith created by the Holy Spirit for one created by the unaided wisdom or reason of man. This is the apostasy, that the human creed is *not* the word of God. This fact stamps all of these instruments with the image and superscription of the great whore, mystery Babylon, the mother of harlots or false systems of religion.

Christianity, as it is revealed and developed in the Scriptures of the New Testament, is not even in the *form* of human science. This is a very insignificant fact. Yet it is demonstrated, in its own original form, by prophecy and miracle. God bore witness to the preaching of the Apostles “both with signs and wonders, and divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Spirit, according to his will.” In this way *alone* Christianity was supported to the rational conviction of honest men. Now, when an attempt is made to present Christianity in a scientific form, as in a human creed, the testimony of signs, and wonders, and divers miracles, which was natural to the first form, is unnatural and inapplicable to the second. That is to say, a human creed cannot be proved true by the miraculous attestations of the Holy Spirit, sent down from heaven—and for the best of all reasons, namely: The Holy Spirit

was not sent into the world to attest any human creed that ever was, or ever may be made. The Spirit came to demonstrate the Gospel itself, not in the form and dress of a human science, but in the simple form of that existence which God gave to it, as a *fact*; and the demonstration was made by suitable and fitting displays of Almighty power and wisdom, and the entire proof committed to authentic writing. Who will pretend that the thirty-nine Articles, or the twenty-five Articles, or any human symbol in the world, is proved true by "*signs and wonders, and divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Spirit?*" We venture that no living man can be found who will so affirm. The idea is profoundly impious and absurd. And yet original Christianity was proved by this supernatural testimony, directly vouchsafed to the facts preached by the Apostles. If, then, the original testimony which proved Christ's Gospel true and of God, is inapplicable to prove the truth of the articles of human creeds, it is because the propositions in the creed are different from those of the Christian religion. The creed and Christianity are absolutely and essentially different in their fundamental character, so that each requires a separate order of proof. This we regard as a pure and solid test, separating the creed and the word of God, or the Gospel of Christ—and clearly showing the immeasurable space between them.

If then, a human creed is not supported by the same testimony as the word of God or Christianity, by what order or class of testimony is it supported at all? It will be said that the creed is supported by the Bible. This is a great mistake. The Bible supports itself alone—and no other book or books in the world. The word of God proves nothing but the Gospel of Christ. It would be stranger than a miracle if Divine revelation were legitimately to prove any thing true except Christianity! This old sophism that a human creed can be proved true by the Bible, needs to be thoroughly exposed. It is a shallow fallacy, and the wonder is how it has deceived men so long. There is, however, a world of mischief in it; and all the innumerable corruptions of Christianity take shelter under it. But even granting that a human symbol may be sustained by the sacred text, it will follow that but *one* document of the kind can be. That the word of God will prove two or more conflicting and contradictory creeds to be true, is intuitively absurd. There can then be but one of all the creeds in Christendom that can claim any support or countenance from the Bible. This cuts the roots of the modern flattery termed orthodoxy, that can be possessed by a hundred warring, antagonistic creeds at one and the same time. Now which creed is it of the multitude that can claim the support of the word of God? Or has *that* creed been yet formed? To these questions there is no

authoritative answer on earth. The answer must be speculative, or merely conveying with it more or less of probability. The test here is unaided human reason. A man must examine both the Bible and the creed, and then decide whether the latter is supported by the former. Now, as reason in man is not infallible, but greatly weak and imperfect, the evidence on which any man accepts and adopts a human creed is the evidence of his own particular reason. Logic, therefore, is the foundation on which every human creed rests—and this logic is the power of judging right residing in each particular person who decides upon the creed. That great mistakes are committed here we know—for the church is split into many factions, each having its human symbol, and each loudly asserting that its own creed is sustained by the word of God, and that no other is. This fact assures us that the speculative logic by which these human symbols are sustained is unworthy of absolute confidence.

After more than three hundred years of creed-making, and creed-proving, among Protestant sects, by the greatest and best educated minds, the question, which particular creed is clearly supported by the word of God? is unanswered. Because, if one creed were thus absolutely honored, all parties would be morally bound to embrace it, and form a grand union upon it. But no sect feels under any moral obligation to disorganize, burn its creed, and adopt another, on the ground that the other is incontrovertibly proved true by the Bible; and for the best reason in the world, to-wit: *That no human creed now existing among sectarians can claim the honor of being unquestionably sustained by the word of God.* It is perfectly clear that a dozen different and irreconcilable methods of solving a mathematical problem would not exist among men, in the face of a *true* solution. All speculation concerning phenomena will naturally cease whenever the facts are really explained. There is then no ground on which to start a new hypothesis. Now if any one of the numerous creeds were really sustained, and proved true by the oracles of God, all counter creeds would naturally and inevitably cease to find honest advocates. The fact of a general division as to which creed is supported, plainly indicates that none can absolutely claim the honor; and the diploma of orthodoxy which the sects confer upon each other arises from the deep consciousness of the fact that no party can absolutely prove its creed; and that Christianity among Protestants has no higher evidence than that of *speculative logic*. Therefore, the word of God bears no direct testimony to any human creed.

Creeds present Christianity in a scientific form. This implies that the Bible reveals it in an unscientific form. This is true as it

regards human science. When the human mind undertakes to construct Christianity scientifically, it must employ nothing but generalization, analysis, and synthesis—that is to say, a strictly logical process is required from beginning to end. When the process is completed—when the science is formed, when the system is completed—the last sentence written—it can *appeal* to nothing *out of itself*, for proof. It is proved true, if proved at all, by its own logic, in its several consecutive processes. To appeal to any other standard of proof, is to imply a want of full and complete logic in the finished science. The solution of a problem in mathematics lies in the processes of the reasoning. The proof of a fact lies in the testimony that is borne to it, and in nothing else. And the proof of a science lies in the logic by which the science is developed. The proof of a scientific form of Christianity lies in that form, and not out of it. It can appeal to nothing outside of its own logic. It cannot appeal to the Bible, since the Bible is just the thing it transforms into a new state—reproduces it in a scientific form. To appeal from a process of reasoning to the Bible, implies that the word of God is plainer than the logic. The moment, therefore, the creed appeals to the Scriptures for proof, that moment it confesses that the Bible is plainer in its teaching than the creed—and that it is of superior authority. Why should the buyer or the seller appeal from his judgment to the scales, if the scales be no more infallible in its decision or assertion than his judgment? The idea is absurd that any appeal can be made to any standard of proof, that is not in itself superior in certainty to any other method of reaching the truth in question. When the creed appeals to the word of God it breaks its own neck. If the Bible is plainer in its teachings than the creed, common sense would say—there is no need of the creed at all. If the Bible is less plain in its teaching than the creed, then it is of less authority also, and no appeal can be taken from the creed to the Bible for proof. There is, therefore, a grand fallacy in the appeal of creed-makers and creed-advocates, to the Holy Scriptures for the demonstration of their scientific forms of Christianity. A greater self-deception never was practiced.

Let us not deceive ourselves with respect to the import of the phrase *scientific form of Christianity*. What is science? It is *certain* knowledge. Pure science is built on self-evident truths, as mathematics. Hence, as the antithesis of pure or exact science, we have *speculative* science, as metaphysics. Science is a collection of the general or first truths of any subject, and the arrangement of them systematically according to accurate classification. What then is *scientific Christianity*? It is the collection of all

the general or first truths or principles of Christianity, and the systematic arrangement of them according to an accurate classification. How, we ask, does the mind get hold of these principles? It is not by experiment or observation. It is by *revelation*. Now, since Christianity is in all its elements a matter of *revelation*, it is impossible for the human mind to trace its general principles any farther than they are announced in the Scriptures. Whether then, the philosophic principles, the first truths, on which Christianity is based, in the Divine intelligence, be revealed, or whether our minds are capable of grasping them as intuitions, is a question to be decided before that of reducing them to a science is acted upon. The first principles of the Divine Existence, of Moral Evil, of the Atonement, of Eternity—these are grave matters for man to deal with in a scientific point of view. That our minds can grasp these unfathomable truths as intuitions so as to form a science out of them, we believe no competent mind will contend. Neither does revelation follow a scientific method. It gives us the philosophy or *rationale* of nothing. Its style is oracular. It enunciates truth, but never philosophizes. It deals in absolute *assertion*, not in the logic of a scientific method. The guarantee of its truth is the *authority of the Almighty God*, and not the authority of *human analysis and synthesis*. It appears to us that a true scientific form of an *unscientific* Revelation is as much impossible as it is to mix light and darkness. If it required the inspiration of the eternal and infallible Spirit to enunciate and demonstrate Christianity, in an *unscientific* form, common sense affirms that it would require the same super-human Intelligence to change its form into that of a real science! Besides, is it possible to construct Christianity into a science under the *laws* of human thought? Can the Infinite and the Eternal be scientifically mapped out in the forms of the *finite* and perishing? Can we have a science of being absolute—of the infinite—of the eternal? All this is surely too great for man's capacity—too high for our science. And is it nothing to bring Christianity into the endless disputes and uncertainties of these unfathomable problems? If this is not *apostasy* we know not what is. If this is not "another Gospel," then is it impossible for another to be manufactured by the subtle genius of either man or the fallen Arch-angel.

A creed or scientific form of Christianity is a purely human conception of the Gospel. It is Christianity according to human logic—not according to Divine inspiration. It can claim no more accuracy than the unassisted minds of the men who produced it. The classification, the analysis, and the synthesis of human creeds are purely of the unassisted reason of man. This is their highest authority. All the imperfections of their authors are in them,

both mental and moral. They are expressions, and but expressions, of their author's minds, touching the disclosures, information, and teachings of the Bible. To make them tests of truth, bonds of fellowship, and Church communion, is to displace or make void the word of God. It is to take an imperfect rather than a *perfect* standard of truth; and to reject the Divine form for a human form of Christianity. What has the Roman Catholic Church done more than this? This is the primordial conception of the great apostasy. This is a *falling away* from the Gospel to a human system falsely called Christianity. Hence every sect is but an individual development of the great Defection. This defection may and does differ in the *matter* of it, in its many developments in the form of parties or sects, yet these all agree as *one* in the great principle of their existence, to-wit: the introduction of a human symbol of faith and practice instead of holding the Divine symbol, which contains "the faith once delivered to the Saints" by God himself.

The testimony, then, on which human creeds rest, is human *reasoning*. They can claim no other support. They are purely speculative theories and systems, the mere products of unassisted reason and reasonings—and as for their matter, they are mixtures of truth and error—fact and fable—and endless speculation on metaphysical abstractions. The "faith once delivered to the Saints" consists of Divine facts and truths, and was proved worthy of universal acceptance, not by the power of human logic, but by "signs and wonders, and divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Spirit." What a vast difference in the testimonies by which the true faith and human creeds are sustained! John Wesley and the Westminster Divines, making creeds, and supporting them by the unaided powers of their own minds, is a very different thing and spectacle from the preaching of the Apostles, with the demonstration of the Spirit in such facts as the resurrection of the dead, the curing of congenital lameness and malignant diseases, the opening of the blind eyes and of deaf ears, at the word of a man or the touch of his finger! God demonstrates the original faith or Gospel, by "infallible proofs"—but man demonstrates human creeds by his puny and sciolistic logic! The faith is of God—the creed is of man. The Bible is the true symbol of the true faith—the creed is a human symbol of another faith—of a false religion. The one is authoritative, being signed by the hand of the living and eternal God—the other is unauthorized, an impudent and impious interpolation, a spurious coin, and a corruption of absolute immutable truth. What a strange infatuation, what a rare and wonderful folly is that, which leads men to adopt and advocate these human creeds and systems, and to substitute them for the old Divine sym-

bol—the Bible! Truly this is “the mystery of iniquity”—the secret triumph of rebellion and insurrection against the King and government of the heavens. It is treachery to Jesus Christ under the guise of devout friendship. It is a joining of the temple of God with idols—a communion with Belial, whose glory consists in making the “worse appear the better reason,” and in spreading through fallen ranks strategies against the King of men and angels.

It is sometimes said that the Bible is held by those who make human creeds bonds of fellowship and tests of religious truth. In what sense the Bible is a rule of faith to a people who have subscribed a human creed is difficult to perceive. We should like to see this point cleared up by some advocate for these human Christianities. We can not see how any man can hold two distinct and different symbols of faith at one and the same time. The idea of a creed is, that it is authoritative over the mind. It dictates the faith of the party adopting it; and from it there is and can be no appeal. Such an appeal is revolutionary, and points at once to the disorganization of the party. Hence this point is well guarded in those churches whose constitution is a human symbol of faith. The moment a man doubts any article laid down in the creed, he loses cast with the brotherhood, and is liable to a prosecution for heresy. If he be a preacher, the peril to himself from making known a doubt respecting an article of prescribed faith is most imminent. He will be cut off and disgraced. There is no salvation for him. He cannot put in a single plea. It is vain for him to argue that the Bible disagrees to the affirmation of the creed; and teaches differently. The creed is the organic law of the party which depends upon it for its existence. A change in the symbol would be a radical change affecting the identity of the church itself. The ministry *especially* must subscribe the symbol, and all their preaching must be in strict accordance with it. To rise up against the central compact, the constitution of the body, the human symbol of faith, is the greatest ecclesiastic sin a minister can commit. He forfeits his membership and plighted honor by such act. The Rev. Albert Barnes, of Philadelphia, was cut off from the Old School Presbyterian party—not for *unbelief* of the Westminster confession—but for an *interpretation* of it contrary to the uniform interpretation of their standards. This shows what authority the creed has in that party, and we believe that other sects are similar in the authority which they attach to their creeds. If a man turn infidel, and openly reject the Bible, of course he forfeits his membership among a community of Christians; and if a man disbelieve the creed he has subscribed, he will be expelled from any strict Protestant sect. Now which has the more authority, the creed or the Bible? The effect to a

minister, in the Old School Presbyterian party, is the same, whether he reject a part of the sacred canon, or the confession, or vary in his interpretation of the articles of the confession from the standards of the church. The confession is held as sacred and as authoritative as the Bible itself. No sectarian preacher dares to interpret the Scriptures contrary to the creed, but at the peril of excommunication or its equivalent. This shows that the creed is above the Bible in authority, and is a real substitute for it. The preacher must believe and preach by the creed. This is his duty, and life-long business. Now in what sense is the Bible a rule of faith to such a man? Plainly in no intelligible sense whatever. The Bible can have no authority in such case. It cannot utter one word except by the mouth of the creed. So true is it that a human symbol of faith is an apostasy from the word of God. No man can serve two masters or serve God and mammon; and as little can any man submit to two creeds; or hold the *Bible* as the rule of faith, and a human creed at one and the same time. No Roman priest dares to oppose the decrees of the council of Trent; and no Presbyterian clergyman dares to oppose the *decrees* of the Westminster Assembly of Divines. The Presbyterian is in the same predicament of the priest; for both have rejected the word of God and adopted a human religion. Each has subscribed a human creed, and agreed to interpret the Bible by it. So of every sect. Rome and Protestant sects are all apostates from the faith of the Gospel—from the sound words of the old symbol delivered by the Spirit to the true church. They have fallen away from the Gospel to human forms of Christianity. The Bible—the word of God—is not their creed, but a human system which stands to them in the same relation that the word of God did to the original church. The Protestant may boast a better creed than that of Rome, as there are degrees even in evil. But the matter is of small moment when the principle of the thing itself is a reflection of Divine Christianity in the only form in which man can possess it. When once the true symbol of faith is lost, and the church has receded from her Divine position and heavenly character, the question as to the matter of her faith is only important as it effects present interests—the temporal good of mankind. Here then will appear the better and the best among human creeds. But the true faith is good in the superlative, and admits of no degrees of comparison.

These human creeds prohibit any increase of Bible knowledge. The man that has subscribed to a human form of Christianity, dares not become wiser than the men who made the symbol. Roman Catholics live under the dominion of the men who consummated the system. The mind of no son of the church can

expand beyond the limits assigned it in the symbol. The same is true of every Protestant. The Methodist cannot, and must not understand the Bible any better than the men who wrote his faith. The Presbyterian lives in the limits prescribed by the Westminster Divines. Their minds are his pattern, and it is excommunication to transcend them. They are a *God* to him, whose perfection may be equalled, but must not be surpassed. To be wise above what is written in the confession is the greatest heresy in the world. That human production is the *mind-gauge* and *thought-balance* for the whole official rank and file of the Presbyterian church. This is to make it just as perfect and authoritative as the inspired word, and to substitute it for the word of God in every practical point of view. Now, unless the Westminster Divines had as clear and perfect knowledge of the Gospel as the Holy Spirit of God, the substitution of *their* symbol of Christianity in place of *His*, is not only wrong, but an *apostasy* from the teaching of the Spirit. The creed not only makes the Bible of no effect, by dethroning it as the supreme rule of faith and practice, but it is a shackle, a chain of bondage upon the mind in studying the Holy Scriptures. We want space to elaborate this fact. It is a grand theme of itself, and has scarcely been touched, much less exhausted, in any investigation extant. The Bible is a volume to be profoundly revered. There is nothing that ought so to command all the attention and energy of the soul, as the Divine communications to man. They should be studied with the most concentrated and conscientious attention and desire to know the truth, in order to the salvation of the soul. Nothing, therefore, ought to come in to distract the attention and the process of the mind in perceiving the truth. But the creed *does* come in between the student and the Bible, and with an authoritative voice, that seldom threatens in vain, says: "BEWARE! *See that you find nothing in the word of God contrary to my teaching.*" This is a fearful admonition; and as it is authoritative, it effectually prevents a free, manly, generous, and faithful study of the Sacred Scriptures. Sectarians cannot avail themselves of the aids and benefits of improved Biblical criticism, hermeneutics, philology, etc. These would lead away from the creed, and they must be scorned, or which is the same thing, they must not be *applied* to the interpretation of the word of God. The creed and religious progress are wholly antagonistic. When a man subscribes a human creed, he says in effect: "*I will never learn any more than is contained in my adopted symbol, while I live.*" Hence, creeds make great stagnant bodies, in whom there is no mental life beyond a fixed limit, and that limit is fixed by *human authority*. Sects cannot advance. They may grow worse, but they cannot

grow better. They never can settle one of the great issues between them. This is "aboon their might." The union of all the followers of Christ in the peace and spirit of the Gospel is impossible on the basis of sectarianism. It cannot—in fact it never has—made an effort for this end. Their quarrels are made immortal. No power in the universe has the right to mediate and reconcile their alienations. They are laid down as items of faith in authoritative human symbols, and made sacred as oracles. They enter into the organic structure of each sectarian body, and co-exist with it. A cessation of hostilities is treason to fundamental faith and fundamental duty. All things must continue as they are. Here the power and authority of these human symbols are clearly seen. They sit in the temple of God—showing themselves that they are gods. The slightest mental progress in the elements of Christianity is essentially revolutionary; and must be put down and kept down. Is not this making gods of these creeds? Are they not genuine idols? Do they not constitute *apostasies* or fallings away from the Apostolic Christianity, in which there is not one human conception—one human element—but everything is Divine? A man's intellectual faculties are under the power of a singular delusion who cannot perceive that these creeds are real gods in authority—and the communities adopting them spurious churches—apostate bodies—the children of the mother of harlots or *apostasies*.

Hitherto we have argued the general principle to which all human creeds are to be referred, and we hope our labor has not been in vain. Principle is eternal—never changes, either in form or nature, but is the same from age to age. We have made no special fact in the matter of any creed the basis of objection or argument. As before observed, it is nothing to pure Christianity what any authoritative human symbol of faith contains. The degrees of approximation to truth are not the point. The thing itself is an apostasy. This is the sin of sins—and after this is committed, the degrees of approach to and divergence from any particular element of the Gospel or the whole Gospel, are only interesting as they may involve the well-being of society in a temporal point of view. Thus, one creed may be more friendly to education in the general than another; and a third may inculcate more effectually a law-abiding spirit. But these are temporal matters, when isolated from original Christianity, and contemplated in relation to human forms of religion. We do not, therefore, enter into a comparison of the merits of different creeds; nor do we make more opposition to one than to all. In the name of God we oppose all of them as various developments of the same LAWLESS OR WICKED SPIRIT, whose destruction is the condition for

a grand triumph of Prince Messiah. There is, however, one glaring fact that shows how these human creeds make void the Word, in a matter, too, involving the accomplishment of the very end for which the Lord of glory and life died and rose from the dead. To this we now invite attention.

The New Testament Scriptures make no allowance for divisions in the church. The Apostolic church was one—a unit. There were no *Christian* denominations in that day. The church of Christ embraced all the believers. That the Apostles did not establish different *denominations* of worshippers is the best reason in the world why it never should have been done. But the Apostles did not only establish the church as one, but labored to preserve that unity, showing that they set a great value on it, as is clearly evinced by such teaching as the following: “Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions, and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple.” “Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions [Greek, *schisms*] among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment.” For it hath been declared unto me of you, my brethren, by them which are of the house of Chloe, that there are contentions among you. Now, this I say, that every one of you saith, I am of Paul; and I of Apollos; and I of Cephas; and I of Christ. Is Christ divided? was Paul crucified for you, or were ye baptized in the name of Paul?” “A man that is an heretic, after the first and second admonition reject; knowing that he that is such, is subverted, and sinneth, being condemned of himself.” The last passage is the same with the others—and cannot be mistaken. The word translated heretic—*hairesicos*—occurs no where else in the New Testament. The noun *hairesis*, occurs several times, and is translated *heresy* and *heresies*. Its true English equivalent is *sect* and *sects*. A heretic is a sectarian, a factionist, a disunionist, a divisionist, a schismatic. “The man who makes divisions in a church, instead of aiming to promote unity, is the one intended” by the term heretic. “The true notion of the word *heretic* is that of one who is a promoter of a sect or party.” It is impossible to see how the spirit could have more emphatically and positively anticipated and denounced denominationalism or sectarianism, than is done in these passages; or how the unity of all believers making one church, could

1 Rom. xvi: 17.
3 1. Cor. i: 10-13.

2 It is translated *sect*, in Acts v: 17—2 John, xvii: 20-21.
4 Ti. iii: 10. 5 Barnes' Notes.

be more clearly enjoined. Let us now hear the Saviour himself, in solemn prayer to the Father and God of all: "Neither pray I for these alone"—the Apostles—"but for them also who shall believe in me through their word: that they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me"? There is no escape from the plain teaching of these and many similar passages. Indeed, we may appeal to the entire New Testament, on this point. It denounces sects and parties, in Christianity, by putting them among the works of the flesh. There is no more shelter for sectarianism in the Scriptures, than for adultery and sorcery, murder and unbelief. Hence a sectarian or schismatic is said to be *self-condemned*—for Christianity allows of no schism in the church. If it is asked what is meant by *one* church, we reply, such *unity*, precisely, as obtained in the *Apostolic* church. This is the model and pattern for all ages.

Human creeds make void the word of God on this soul-inspiring theme. They inaugurate divisions; and, in fact, are the inauguration of schisms in the family of God on earth. Nay, *divisions* are openly advocated and justified in the teeth of the inspired word of God, by all the sects in the land. Sermons are preached to show that a division of the church into various sects and parties is a great blessing to mankind. The prayer of Christ for the *unity* of all who believe in him through the Apostles' word is explained away into the tenuity of spiritual transcendentalism. It is a vague sentiment—an invisible unity—an abstraction, that has no real existence in the relations of men, or that is inappreciable as a quality in the moral characters of professed Christians. It is not a fact in the existence of the church, as explained by our Sectaries. The Apostle said that sectarians would deceive the hearts of the simple by "*good words and fair speeches*." It is in this way, by *Belial-like* eloquence, that the creed, which is the type and fact of schism, is carried in triumph over the Bible—over the purpose for which Messiah shed his blood; the church divided and sub-divided into endless parties, until she is as weak as a dying infant, and becomes the reproach and hiss of the sarcastic infidel. We arraign the creed, written or unwritten, as the cause of division, and as making the word of God of no effect with respect to its pointed teaching on the unity of the church—not to instance others. The art of interpretation among the sects is the art of making the Scriptures say just what a man or a sect *wishes* them to say. This fact has grown to such general notoriety, that the *world* has *lost* confidence in the word of God, and men have settled down into open or concealed infidelity, or have despaired of understanding the Scriptures at all. A general *indifferentism*

that is worse by far than any open form of skepticism, characterizes the age in which we live; nor can the power of the sects reach it. The Saviour teaches that the unity of the church is the condition for the conversion of the world. The truth of this lesson is demonstrated in the history of sectarian efforts. The small portion of civilized nations which we have any right at all to recognize as believers, implies a triumph of infidelity fearful to contemplate. The reason is apparent and lies on the surface of almost every chapter in the Bible. It is the endless schisms of the church, the matter of which consists in the human symbols of faith by which sects and parties are organized into antagonistic bodies. This is a burlesque on the death of Christ, who suffered that He might unite all peoples in one church, in one loving and peaceful brotherhood; and that alienations, hatreds, envies, and heart-burnings, might be exchanged for universal peace and goodwill.

And what are the Christianities of these various human creeds? They consist of theories, philosophies, and speculative dogmatisms and rationalisms! Here are the five thorny points of Calvinism and Arminianism—freedom and necessity—Trinitarianism, Unitarianism, Socinianism, Arianism; Presbyterianism, Episcopalianism, Congregationalism, and Independency—and a thousand other matters more than any living man can ever distinctly contemplate while the world stands. These cold, fruitless, metaphysical speculations have taken the place of the Gospel, and set the church by the ears. Not one of them is taught in the word of God. Not one of them is a component element of the Gospel of Christ. No inspired man, prophet or Apostle, ever presented one of these barren dogmas to a living man or woman in order to remission of sins, church fellowship and communion, or the enjoyment of the hope of immortality and eternal life in the Lord Jesus Christ. These speculations and speculative theories are not once found in any teaching of the Messiah, or in any discourse of the Apostles as reported in the Acts. They belong to another age and to different classes of minds. The abstract questions of these theories are, for the most part, above the comprehension of the human reason, and revelation sheds no light upon them. They are not the themes of the Bible. No sacred writer touches one of them. They are, therefore, insoluble problems, whose solution would not benefit any man as far as his present happiness or his eternal salvation is concerned. "*No difficulty emerges in theology, which had not previously emerged in philosophy.*"¹ The difficulties of speculative philosophy have been seized upon by our religious system-builders and creed-mongers, and carried

¹ Sir William Hamilton.

over into the field of Christianity, and made the platforms of sects and parties. This is the whole truth; and consequently the belief of these theories never yet saved a sinner from the error of his way, and never can; for there is nothing in them to redeem a lost world. Many of these questions, in another dress of words, were discussed by the old heathen philosophers, quite as satisfactorily as learned Christian Divines have done, and without doing a thousandth part of the mischief. If these metaphysical abstractions and freezing subtleties were the Gospel, there would have been no place for prophecies and miracles as proofs of their truth. They are not the character of questions to be settled by miracle; but must be settled, if at all, by logic. This shows them to be no part of Christianity.

These spurious Christianities, have developed a new terminology which is wholly unknown to the Bible. This system of terms is harsh, uncouth, scholastic, and hostile in meaning to that of the New Testament writers. A new symbol of faith, and a new nomenclature indicate a new religion. An Apostle would not understand the terminology of Christendom, by any knowledge he possesses of the original Gospel. "New terms imperceptibly make way for new doctrines; nor has any subtlety of the enemy of souls succeeded better in corrupting the mind from the simplicity there is in Christ, than modernizing the language of Divinity. When men are shy of the "words the Holy Ghost teacheth," we are always afraid they are beginning to be ashamed of the things."¹

Meanwhile, notwithstanding the clashing and jarring discords of the apostate religious world, the Bible utters its still small voice. The New Testament contains "the faith formerly delivered to the Saints." This faith has been demonstrated, proved true and of God, not by Augustine or his disciple, John Calvin; nor by any other mere man dead or living, but "by signs, and wonders, and divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Spirit" to the Apostles of Christ. There is not a human element in this faith. It is as pure as the breath of God, and as fresh and regenerating as it was when it fell from the lips and pens of Apostles and Prophets. It is a grand fountain of light, life, and immortal health, to every one who desires to be delivered from sin by the hand of God, and to be elevated into a joyful fellowship with Christ, and elect spirits, whose names are written in heaven. This is the sovereign remedy for all the debating in Christendom. The word of God can cure every disease caught from the pestilent city of Rome. It knows nothing about Methodism, Presbyterianism, Baptistism, Lutheranism, Calvinism, Arminianism, Trinita-

¹ Jay's Christian Contemplated, p. 22.

rianism or Unitarianism, any more than it does about Mormonism or Romanism. It knows nothing of any *ism* whatever, but it develops perfectly the Gospel of Christ, and promises eternal honors to all who believe and obey it. A return to original Christianity is a return from all speculative systems, to the word of God; deriving the faith from the positive *assertion*, and the practice from the positive *commands*, of the Holy Spirit. This is the only way to come out of the apostasy; and this is to leave the devoted city, and to gain the liberty and joy of the promised land. Hence we plead for the old Gospel in the words of the Apostles, and urge the union of all true believers upon the Scriptures alone; holding nothing for which we have not a thus saith the Lord; and requiring no test of fellowship but a sincere belief in, and a cordial obedience to, the Lord Jesus Christ. We have a generous confidence in the truth that it will prevail.

THERE are wanderers, whom neither pride nor a perverse humor has led astray; and whose condition is such, that I think few more worthy of a man's best directions. For the more imperious sects having put such unhandsome vizards on Christianity, and the *sincere milk of the word* having been every where so sophisticated by the humors and inventions of men, it has driven these anxious melancholists to seek for a teacher that cannot deceive the voice of the Eternal Word within them; to which if they be faithful, they assure themselves it will be faithful to them in return. Nor would this be a groundless presumption, if they had sought this voice in the reason and the conscience, with the Scripture articulating the same, instead of giving heed to their fancy and mistaking bodily disturbances, and the vapors resulting therefrom, for inspiration and the teaching of the Spirit.—*Henry More*.

WHY MEN FEAR TO INSPECT THEIR HEARTS.—In countries enlightened by the Gospel, however, the most formidable and (it is to be feared) the most frequent impediment to men's turning their minds inwards upon themselves, is that they are afraid of what they shall find there. There is an aching hollowness in the bosom, a dark cold speck at the heart, an obscure and boding sense of a somewhat that must be kept out of sight of the conscience; some secret lodger whom they can neither resolve to eject or retain.—*Coleridge*.

CRITICISM OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

THE great object of the Quarterly is to become subservient, in the way in which it best can, to the true interests of humanity. In no way, it is thought, can this its purpose be so effectually carried out as by aiding the influx of Bible light into the human mind. This, to speak generally, can be done in two ways. First, by the removal of such intervening obstacles, where they exist, as intercept this light and prevent it entering the mind. These obstacles, it is almost needless to say, have, by the cunning and perseverance of the adversary, become so multiplied that they are innumerable by us, and yield in most instances to attempts at removing them with the greatest reluctance. This work is therefore vast and endless while we are in the flesh. Second, where these obstacles either do not exist or have been removed, by presenting, at second-hand of course, the light in question immediately to the mind. We say at second-hand, for, at first-hand, this light exists no where save in the pages of the great book just named. The honor to which we aspire, and may the aspiration not be wholly in vain, is humbly to aid in translating this light from the sacred page to the human mind and heart. With a view to this purpose we hope to be able to devote a section in each number to the especial business of sacred criticism.

But what do we mean by *sacred criticism*? The word *sacred* limits the criticism to the contents of the Bible, while the criticism itself is an effort to present the true meaning of a given word, or given text, free from all admixture of error. Of the rules and principles by which this can be best done we shall not here speak.

Of course these criticisms are not presented as final. In most cases they will be submitted as mere inquiries and suggestions and not as dogmatic decisions. Our brethren were once famous for their clever study of the Holy Scriptures. We have fears, well founded, we are only too sorry to say, that they have declined a little in this respect. We are anxious to see them return to the venerated practice of time gone; and shall delight to favor every means which can in the least facilitate such a movement. We are more than solicitous that this department of the Quarterly shall be varied, profitable, and deeply interesting. We invite the attention of our brethren to it; and, in hope, ask for contributions from every pen that has a word to speak in season and to the mark. As inaugurating the work to which we allude we respectfully submit the following samples:

I. "*In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.*" Gen. ii: 17.

Here, for the first time in the history of the Universe, as far as we know, was uttered that ill-omened and fearful word "die." It must then have been a strange sound to man; and it is difficult to conceive how, without aid, the record of which is lost to us, its full import could have been realized by him. Yet such must have been the case; for in a mere empty sound he could have read no dreadful penalty of his future sin. But we did not sit down to muse on the word, nor yet to conjecture the sensations its first use may have caused. What then is the difficulty of the passage? It is concisely this:—

It solemnly denounces death against Adam "*in the day*" in which he should sin; yet we have the historic fact that in the day in which he sinned he did not die.

How now shall these two things be made to stand together? If, says the infidel, you accept as true the denouncement of God, you belie the historic record; but if you accept as true the historic record, you belie the denouncement of God. Choose your alternative.

Now, however little we are inclined, and certainly we are as much so as can well be imagined, to pen even one line to gratify the captious spirit of infidelity, still we feel compelled to acknowledge a real difficulty in the case. We may prove very unequal to the task of solving it, nevertheless we shall have the candor frankly to confess it. As containing a solution of the difficulty chiefly two theories have been suggested.

The first is, to assume that the term "day" is not to be construed strictly as denoting merely a period of twenty-four hours, but freely as expressing a period of time of indefinite length. This time is then so extended as to embrace the entire period of Adam's natural life.

The objection to this theory is that the meaning it attaches to the term "day" is *purely arbitrary*. This renders its solution utterly devoid of any claim to our confidence. We hence dismiss it at once. I shall not deny that the word day is sometimes used in the Bible indefinitely; but this must not be merely assumed in a given case as in the present; it must appear palpable from the circumstances of the case that it is so. We have not the slightest reason to conclude that the term day has not here its usual signification of twenty-four hours. The first theory therefore cannot be accepted as solving the difficulty.

The second theory assumes that the word "die" is not to be taken in its usual acceptation as expressing natural death, but in a still more fearful sense as expressing *spiritual* death.

This theory we think liable to more numerous as well as to more serious objections than the preceding. For in the first place it is liable to precisely the same objection which lay fatally against that. The sense it attaches to the word "die" is wholly arbitrary. It has no sanction from Holy Writ, neither from any facts to be learned elsewhere. That the word "die" had in the lips of God when speaking to Adam the same meaning which it had in the lips of Moses when recording, more than two thousand years subsequently, the mournful event to which it relates, can hardly be questioned. For if it had not, since the cotemporaries of Moses would constantly understand it in the sense in which it was current in their time, it follows that while they attached to the term in the second chapter of Genesis one meaning, it in reality bore another, and hence they were misled by it every time they read the chapter. This is highly unlikely.

But further, what is the meaning of the phrase *spiritual death*? This, it seems to me, is one of those handy combinations which men have coined either to conceal their ignorance or to inculcate some suspicious tenet, rather than to express aught sanctioned by the word of God. Is it meant by the phrase that in the day in which Adam sinned his spirit died within him, or became extinct, as the light of a candle dies under the extinguisher? Surely not; for that a spirit dies is wholly inconsistent with every conception we have of it. What then can be the meaning of the phrase? Bodily death is the death of the body, what then should spiritual death be but the death of the spirit? This phrase is deeply objectionable. Indeed if it has any meaning at all, it is a bad one and one wholly unauthorized by the Bible. We therefore feel compelled to reject the solution afforded by this theory.

To the preceding is still perhaps to be added a third theory, for which, if I mistake not, we are indebted to our own ingenious and amiable brother, Dr. Richardson. This theory, as well as I now recollect, also attempts to discover the solution in the import of the word "die." This term, it assumes, signifies *separation*. The term *day*, however, it takes in its ordinary acceptation. Its solution is then the following: That in the very day in which Adam sinned he was *separated* from God, that is, cut off, both in spirit and in body, from his former communion with him; that after this, like the twig sundered from its parent stock, his glory fled from him, he became enfeebled in intellect, and languished in bodily infirmities until at last wasted and exhausted he dropped into the grave.

The objection to this theory is obvious: it is, that what the word "die" happens to *imply* merely, and not what it was intended to express, is assumed to be its meaning. In death it so happens that

there is a separation as well of spirit and body as of man from this his appointed place of abode; but that this is what the word *die* was intended to express is not shown. Such import is not in the original Hebrew word which is certainly to be our guide in this particular. That Adam was separated, in the day in which he sinned, from his previous intimate communion with God, is true; and that the consequences followed as named in this theory, I fully believe. But this is not what the word *die* signifies. While, therefore, I accept this theory as correct, except in a single particular, yet since this is the very particular in which lies the whole difficulty of the case, I feel compelled to reject it.

And, now, to the preceding we propose to add a fourth theory which, after all, may fall as far short of suggesting the true solution as have they. It is submitted with becoming deference.

First, then, I take the word "day" as expressing simply a period of twenty-four hours; and second, the word "die" as signifying neither more nor less than natural or ordinary death; as expressing, in other words, precisely what God meant when he said to Adam "dust thou art and to dust shalt thou return." In these two acceptations I feel compelled to take these two words by one of the most inexorable laws of exegesis. I cannot depart from them. But I shall be told that this renders the difficulty insuperable. Be it so, I must not violate the law of interpretation which applies in the case, and which is absolutely true, in order to furnish what, in that event, would be, at best, only a possible solution; neither shall I reject the Bible because I cannot explain its difficulty. Firmly I stand here. Infidels may sneer if they see fit; I am not moved by that. If this passage were rendered as luminous as the sun in the heavens they would still cavil at something else. The difficulties on account of which they reject the Bible are not in it but in their own hearts. When right there, the Bible's difficulties will be few and small.

The case then stands thus: God said to Adam, first: "*You shall surely die;*" and this was simply natural death; second, "*in the day*" in which you sin; and this was an ordinary day of twenty-four hours. Yet in that day Adam did not die. How now can this be explained?

I go forward a little in time, and find Adam and his sons offering sacrifices to the Lord. These were both numerous and varied. Among them, however, I discover one to which was attached a peculiar significance and value, one rising in mystic importance high over all the rest. This was the offering of *life*, or of *blood* with the life in it; for we learn that "the life of the flesh is in the blood." And this was the sacrifice made in all cases of sin, and in all cases made for sin. "It is the blood that maketh an atone-

ment for the soul." I now ask myself when for *the first time* was this peculiar offering made? And answer indefinitely, when the *necessity* for it first arose. But when was that? I answer conjecturally, in *the day* when Adam sinned. In that day was he to die; hence in that day arose the necessity for offering life, his life. But now God, instead of demanding *his* life, according to the mere letter of the law he had violated, in mercy allowed him to substitute another life in lieu of his own, and to offer that. In other words, he allowed him to take a lamb, and offer its blood with its life in it instead of his own life; so that the lamb died instead of the man, and the man lived instead of the lamb. In that day then Adam died a literal death, not however in his own person, but in his substitute. And this substituted life God accepted in virtue of that ineffable life which Christ, the true lamb, was in coming time to lay down for all; and of which that substituted life became thenceforward the expressive type. In form, then, Adam lived through that and other days in virtue of God's accepting the life of a lamb instead of his own life, but in fact and in reality, in virtue of that glorious Divine life which was at last offered, not for Adam alone, but for all mankind. So that every moment Adam lived after the day in which he sinned, he lived a life drawn from the blood of Christ; and the same is true of every other human being. All human life had perished in Adam but for this gracious arrangement. Hence every instant we live, whether saint or sinner, we live a life drawn immediately from Christ. There is a sublime significance in the saying "in Him was life."

But this arrangement by which Adam lived instead of a lamb, and on through coming years, was to be merely temporary. It did not render him immortal. It operated merely as to natural life, and only for the time being. Hence when God saw fit to suspend its operation and to demand the *really forfeited* life, the man yielded it up.

Here I wish to point out what I conceive to be a fine distinction between the death of the typical lamb and that of Christ. The death of the lamb was simply, *ἀντί* instead of Adam's life, and operated merely as to his present life, and then only temporarily. It was to this extent only, and in this sense that it was typical. Christ also died *ἀντί* instead of us, and *ad huc*, so far His death affects only our present life, and that for the time being. It is in virtue of His death *ἀντί* instead of us, that we live the life we are now living, and as long as we now live it. But Christ died also *ὡς ἑπ* for us, that is that we might live forever hereafter. In this sense the lamb never died for any one. Death *ὡς ἑπ* for us is peculiar to Christ, and looks wholly to the future.

II. "*Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.*"

The following is Dr. Campbell's rendering of this verse: "*Happy the poor who repine not, for the Kingdom of Heaven is theirs.*" Is this candid translator right in this? We feel constrained to think not. Indeed we think this one of the few instances in which this soundest of Bible critics has completely missed the sense of the sacred text. His error has its origin in the assumption that *πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι*, *poor in spirit* is an idiomatic phrase, and is to be rendered much as a compound word. His language is: "I have assigned my reasons, Diss. xi. part 1, sec. 18, for thinking that it is as much the business of a translator to translate phrases as to translate words. An idiomatic phrase stands precisely on the same footing with a compound word. The meaning is commonly learnt from the usual application of the whole word, or of the whole phrase, and not by the detached meanings of the several parts, which, in another language, conjoined in the same manner, may convey either no meaning at all, or a meaning very different from the author's. Such, in a particular manner, is the meaning which the phrase *poor in spirit* naturally conveys to English ears. *Poor spirited*, which to appearance is coincident with it, is always employed in a bad sense, and denotes mean, dastardly, servile. *Poor-ness of spirit* is the same ill quality in the abstract. The phrase, therefore, in our language, if it can be said to suggest any sense suggests one different from the sense of the text."

That this conclusion was true of *some* English ears at the time when Dr. Campbell wrote, we shall not deny; for he was very competent to form a correct judgment in the case; but that it is true of *all* English ears in our day, or of even any in this country, we feel safe in denying.

But on what ground is it assumed that the phrase *πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι*, *poor in spirit*, is *idiomatic*, and is to be rendered like a compound word? Certainly this point, which is most essential to Dr. Campbell's rendering, he has not sustained; and this being not sustained, neither being true, we are left to fall back on the *individual* as well as the conjunct force of the Saviour's words to collect His meaning. This is now not difficult.

1. *μακάριοι*. English version, *blessed*, Dr. Campbell, *happy*. Most critics concur in the latter word; but we confess we have not been able to see that the weight of evidence is decisive in its favor. The preference to be given to the one word over the other seems to depend more on the taste and feelings of the translator than on any thing else; and since we confess to a decided partiality for the fine old word *blessed* we shall decide in its favor.

2. *πτωχοὶ*, *poor*. Primarily this word denotes that crouching,

lowly mien so noticeable in beggars, and by an easy transition comes to express in the lips of the Saviour *the deep, conscious wants of the soul*. It is the finest word in the language for the office it performs. No reference is had in it to *meanness* of spirit as implying either a want of principle or of talents, the thing to which Dr. Campbell objects when speaking of the phrase *poor in spirit*. It expresses the felt want of the human spirit for the "true riches" of Christ. It should never be rendered humble either alone or combined with τὸ πνεύματι. It implies humility, I grant, but this is not what it expresses.

3. τὸ πνεύματι, *the spirit*. On this word neither criticism nor comment is needed. To assign it any other than its usual meaning would be without any warrant in the laws of interpretation. It signifies simply *the spirit*.

Upon the whole, therefore, we should regret to see our existing English version of this passage changed. Altered it may be, but it will not be improved. Thus, then, let it stand: *Blessed are the poor in spirit, for the kingdom of heaven is theirs*.

III. "*But if any provide not for his own, and especially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel.*" 1 Tim. v: 8.

I never knew a covetous Christian that could not quote this verse, and never knew one that had any use for any other. It is to him what God was to Abraham after the rescue of Lot, "a shield and an exceeding great reward," the conservator of his purse, a sedative to his fears, and a universal justification of his sin.

The meaning of the verse is easy except the reference contained in the words "own" and "house." Do both these words refer simply and exclusively to a man's own family, that is to his wife and children? That such is the view of the common people is certain; and indeed if it be not the view of some critics they have failed to mark the distinction as clearly as they should. But is this view right? It is not only not right, but utterly wrong.

The subject treated of in the paragraph to which the verse belongs is unquestionably, certain widows or the manner in which they were to be provided for, and the persons who were to do it. True, it also contains a reference to a man's wife and children, and enjoins their especial support; but the support of certain widows is its leading thought. Of these widows there were two classes, one of whom had to be supported by the congregation, the other by their children and grand-children; for the word ἐγγονα means grand-children, and not nephews as our common version has it. This is plain from the second verse in the paragraph, which reads thus: "But if any widow have children or grand-

children, let them learn first to show piety at home, and to requite their parents, for this is good and acceptable before God." Now it is to these widows that reference is made in the verse in hand. According to this view, its meaning is: If any Christian man provides not for his own widowed mother or grand-mother, and especially for his wife and children, "he hath denied the faith and is worse than an infidel." Such we think the true meaning of the verse. The distinction between *οἰκεῖον* as denoting the immediate family of wife and children, and *ιδίον* as marking the more remote but still close relation of mother and grand-mother is worthy of notice.

IV. "*Now, when John had heard in the prison the works of Christ, he sent two of his disciples, and said to him, Art thou he that should come, or do we look for another?*" Mat. xi: 2-3.

The difficulty here is this: Did John really doubt whether the person to whom he sent was the Christ or not?

I do not know that any thing of vital importance to us depends on the settlement of this question. That it is without interest, I shall not say; still I must think it rather curious than deeply profitable. One thing, however, is certain, that learned men have thought it of sufficient moment to justify an earnest effort to answer it.

A very general opinion in the case is, that John caused the inquiry to be made by his disciples for their own sake, and not for his. Without attempting any formal refutation of this opinion, I shall simply say, that if it be not utterly without foundation, the ground on which it rests is purely conjectural. That the narrative itself suggests the opinion, seems to me to be the last thing that would occur to a careful reader of it. I shall hence dismiss it without further notice.

The only other opinion which I shall notice, is that John really doubted. That there are many strong facts and circumstances which go to render this highly improbable I shall grant. Let them be enumerated.

John was the Saviour's second-cousin, and I take for granted was well acquainted with the whole of his early life. He must have known well all the facts connected with his miraculous conception; such as the appearing of the angel to Mary, and his announcement to her; the angel's appearing to Joseph, and the name he directed him to call Christ; the inspired testimony of his own father and mother; the testimony of Anna and Simeon—all this he surely had not forgotten. Further, his own mysterious life and experience could not have been without great weight. He was sent of God to prepare a people for Christ; had immersed Him; had seen the Spirit descend upon Him, and had been divinely

assured that he of whom he should see this was the Christ; had himself pointed Him out as the Lamb of God; how could he have forgotten all these, together with other facts which we need not enumerate, and how with them in his mind could he doubt? We shall neither deny the difficulty of the case, nor seek to weaken its force.

Still, in the face of all this, we feel compelled to believe that John really doubted. For this belief we have but a single reason, to-wit: *That his own inquiry actually implies it.* We say his own inquiry; for be it noticed that the question he causes to be put to the Saviour is not put as if for any one else except himself, neither as implying another's doubt. It is clearly his own inquiry and put for his own sake. Again, we say his inquiry *implies the doubt.* Are we right in this? If I say of this metal, is it silver or is it platinum, that my language implies doubt in my mind is intuitively certain. It neither admits nor requires proof. So when John asks, *Are you the coming one, the Christ, or must we look for another,* that his language implies doubt is indisputable. This point, then, we hold as settled. Well, and now what comes of it? It affects no man's faith, and proves nothing save (if this need proof) that even the most favored are, after all, men of like infirmities with ourselves. I well know how sensitive some pious people are in regard to such conclusions as the preceding, and how they shrink from them—a fact which serves to account, no doubt, for the many strained and unnatural efforts which have been made to relieve the memory of John from the charge in question. Still this is not right. Let the Bible utter its true meaning without restraint from us or solicitude on our part; and in the end this will be best both for it and for men. I certainly regret to believe that John doubted, and scarcely less to know that Abraham prevaricated in Egypt, and that David took Uriah's wife. But so the matter stands, and no wish of ours can alter it.

But how did it come to pass that John doubted? We may find it very difficult, indeed impossible, to answer this question. That he doubted is certain, but why he did it, can only be conjectured. As possibly containing the answer, we submit the following:

In preparing a people for the Lord, John had a vast work to perform, for which the Lord inspired and strengthened him. While engaged in this work his mind was intensely active, and the glow of the Spirit was upon him. Then he could not doubt. But at length his "decrease" came on, his work was done, and in prison he was left to become simply himself. He now had no work to perform for God, none for man; hence the fervor of inspiration was no longer needed. From the Spirit he was left with no more aid than is afforded to other servants of God when they

have no work to accomplish, save their own salvation. His mind from having formerly been extraordinarily excited, had now become correspondingly inactive. The grand scenes through which he had passed, and in which he had acted a part, were now the imperfect reproduction of an imagination cooled and working feebly. For it is a curious fact that the more extraordinary the scene through which we pass to-day, the more dream-like will it appear to-morrow. Such was John's condition, and such his reminiscences of the past. In this condition doubts arose in his mind and hung their shadows there. Oppressed with them, he sent to Christ saying: "Art thou he that should come, or do we look for another?" Thus do we account for the doubt of this extraordinary man.

To the foregoing I must yet add, that the eulogy pronounced by the Saviour upon John just as the messengers of the latter left with the Saviour's reply, contains nothing inconsistent with the conclusion and explanation now submitted. That eulogy had reference to what John was in the days of his glory, and not to what he was at the time when it was uttered. Indeed, may not its closing sentence contain an implied allusion to the very doubt and infirmity of which we have been speaking? "Verily, I say to you," is the sentence, "among them that are born of woman, there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist: notwithstanding he that is least in the Kingdom of Heaven is greater than he." Why greater? Because he that is least in the kingdom of heaven holds in his heart an unwavering faith in Christ, which John with all his greatness did not. Again, the last sentence in the Saviour's reply to John is very significant, namely: "And blessed is he whosoever shall not be offended in me." What means this being "offended in me?" or as one of our best Lexicons has it, being "affected with scruples toward me," if nothing was wrong with John? The language and circumstances make the sentence suggestive.

A GOOD INTENTION.—A good intention joined to a good action, gives it its proper force and efficiency; joined to an evil action, extenuates its malignity, and in some cases may take it wholly away; and joined to an indifferent action, turns it to virtue, and makes it meritorious as far as human actions can be so.
—*Spectator.*

A SYNOPSIS OF THE FAITH AND PRACTICE OF THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

Meeting at the corner of Jefferson Avenue and Beaubien Street, Detroit: together with the By-Laws which regulate the Order and Business of the Church.

SYNOPSIS.

For the information of the public, the following statement of faith and practice is put forth by the Church of Christ meeting at the corner of Jefferson Avenue and Beaubien street, in the city of Detroit.

I. We accept the Bible—Old and New Testaments—as the word of God; as furnishing the only certain and sufficient knowledge of God, of Salvation, of Duty and of Destiny: so that we need no other basis of faith, guide to duty, or bond of union, than is therein contained. *All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.* 2d TIM. III. 16, 17.

II. While eschewing the metaphysical distinctions and technicalities of philosophies and creeds, on the subject of the Trinity, as being fruitful sources of confusion and strife among Christians, we recognize the tri-unity of the Godhead in the teachings of the New Testament, and accept, in the fullest sense; as a matter of *revelation*, and not of *philosophy*; of *faith*, and not of *speculation*, every Bible utterance concerning Father, Son and Holy Spirit. MATT. XI. 27: JOHN I. 1-5, 14: JOHN XIV. 16, 17; XVI. 7-15: MATT. XXVIII. 19.

III. We regard the Divinity of the Lord Jesus, as emphatically the Christian creed—the truth to be believed; out of which, when believed, flows salvation to the sinner; out of which also, spring the obligations, enjoyments, and hopes of spiritual life. Hence, in laboring for the conversion of sinners, this is the great theme; and in accepting converts to baptism, the only confession of faith to which they are required to assent is, That Jesus is the Son of God, and the Anointed Prophet, Priest and King, through whom we are to obtain “wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption.” MATT. XVI. 15-20; 1st. COR. III. 11; EPH. II, 19-22; JOHN XX. 31; ACTS. VIII. 35-38; 1st. JOHN V. 1.

IV. Not only do we accept as facts, the death of Christ as a sin-offering, and his resurrection from the dead; but we regard these mighty facts as constituting the very Gospel by which we are saved. 1st. COR. XV. 1-4. Facts, Precepts, Promises, comprise the Gospel scheme. Jesus, the Divine Saviour, is the center of all these. The *facts* concerning Jesus, *believed*; the *commandments* of Jesus, *obeyed*; the *promises* of Jesus, *enjoyed*; these constitute the *essentials* of the Christian religion—the marrow and fatness of the Gospel feast.

V. Faith and repentance are the indispensable prerequisites of baptism. An entire reliance on Jesus as a crucified and risen Saviour, joined with such a sorrow for sin as shall lead the heart and life away from wickedness, to the service of the Lord, is en-

joined on, and required of every person seeking admission to baptism and church membership.

VI. To such a believing penitent, baptism is "for the remission of sins;" not as *procuring* or *meriting* pardon, nor yet as accomplishing spiritual regeneration; but as *bringing the believer into contact with Gospel promises*, and conveying to him a scriptural assurance of forgiveness. Hence we teach every person coming to baptism, to trust implicitly the Saviour's promise—"He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." MARK. XVI. 15, 16.

VII. In baptism, the believer is immersed "in the name," or *by the authority* of the Lord Jesus, "into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit;" and thus enters into covenant relationship with God as his Father, with Jesus as his Saviour, and with the Holy Spirit as his Comforter. Being buried with Jesus by baptism into death, and rising to walk in a new life, he is entitled to the promises of the Gospel, and is under the most solemn covenant obligations to walk in all the commandments of the Lord.

Presuming not to judge those who have honestly mistaken sprinkling or pouring for baptism, but who show in their lives a cheerful conformity to all the known will of God, we nevertheless feel bound to maintain the integrity of this ordinance, First—because we dare not interfere with divine appointments, to change either their *form* or their *design*; and, Secondly—because we see in immersion, which all admit, and not in sprinkling or pouring, which but a part accept, a possibility of ending controversy and promoting union among the people of God. We do not wish, however, to place any obstacle in the way of any of the children of God who may desire to partake with us of the Lord's Supper, or to share in any of the privileges of Christian worship.

NOTE.—We submit the following passages of Scripture touching the *action*, the *subjects* and the *design* of baptism to the careful consideration of the reader.

I. They were baptized by him in the river Jordan. Matt. iii. 6: Mark i. 6. John was baptizing in Enon near to Salim, because there was much water there. John iii. 23. And they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him. And when they were come up out of the water, the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip, that the eunuch saw him no more; and he went on his way rejoicing. Acts viii. 38, 39. They were buried with Him by baptism into death. Rom. vi. 4. If we have been planted together in the likeness of his death. Rom. vi. 5. Buried with Him in baptism, wherein also we are risen with Him. Col. ii. 12. The bath or washing of water. Eph. v. 26. Bath of regeneration. Titus iii. 5.

II. He that believeth, and is baptized. Mark xvi. 16. Repent and be baptized. Acts ii. 38. They that gladly received the word were baptized. Acts ii. 41. Believers were added to the Lord, multitudes both of men and women. Acts v. 14. When they believed Philip they were baptized, both men and women. Acts viii. 12. What hinders me to be baptized? If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. Acts viii. 36, 37. Crispus, the chief ruler of the synagogue, believed on the Lord with all his house; and many of the Corinthians, hearing, believed and were baptized. Acts xviii. 8. Buried with Him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with Him, through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised Him from the dead. Col. ii. 12.

III. He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved. Mark xvi. 16. Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. Acts ii. 38. Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord. Acts xxii. 16. Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he

cannot enter into the Kingdom of God. John iii. 5. Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus; for as many as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ. Gal. iii. 26, 27. Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy He saved us, by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit. Tit. iii. 5. The like figure whereunto baptism doth also now save us, (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ. 1st Peter iii. 21.

VIII. Being desirous of returning, as fully as possible, to the purity and simplicity of Primitive Christianity, we have been led, from a careful examination of the Scriptures, to the following conclusions:

1. The first church of Christ was planted in Jerusalem, on the Pentecost succeeding the resurrection of the Messiah. See Acts II. *in extenso*.

2. Its converts were accepted to baptism and church membership, on their faith in Christ, and repentance toward God—and not upon subscription to any human creed or articles of faith.

3. "They that gladly received the word were baptized;" no infant membership was recognized.

4. "They continued steadfastly in the Apostles' teaching and fellowship, in breaking of bread and in prayers." Acts II. 42. *In the teaching of the Apostles*, therefore, as found in Acts and in the Epistles, are Christians to find an *authoritative* utterance of the will of God.

5. From the apostolic teaching we learn: That all the baptized believers dwelling in one locality, constituted the church in that locality.

That every church when organized by an Apostle or Evangelist, was an independent community, so far as its own affairs were concerned, with a government of its own; dependent on and amenable to other churches only so far as the sentiments of Christian brotherhood, or the demands of weakness or poverty, might allow of a mutual claim for counsel and co-operation.

That every church, when fully organized, had a Bishop and Pastor, and frequently a plurality of Bishops, to preside over its spiritual interests; and Deacons, who attended to the wants of the poor, and the temporal interests of the church, and assisted likewise in its spiritual ministrations.

That the churches met on the first day of the week for prayer, praise, preaching, teaching, exhortation, observance of the Lord's Supper, contributions for benevolent purposes, and the cultivation of brotherly love.

That as soon as the ability of a church or of neighboring churches allowed of it, Evangelists or Missionaries, duly qualified and approved, were sent forth to preach the Gospel in other regions, foster infant churches, and oversee them until organized.

That in accomplishing all these functions, the churches had nothing but apostolic teachings to guide them, in all matters of expediency outside of apostolic teaching, every church acting on its own responsibility.

That human leaderships, sects and parties were discouraged and denounced as anti-Christian.

That on this simple basis of the Lordship of Christ and apostolic

authority, it was sought to unite in one brotherhood, all who received Jesus as their Saviour and King.

We seek to return to this standard of the Apostles' doctrine. In this age of division and distraction, we esteem it our especial duty to call Christians from the confusions of the apostasy to the order and harmony of the primitive church; from human creeds and philosophies to the Bible; from party to Christ; from denominational names and interests, to the symmetry and perfection of the Body of Christ; from speculative theology, which divides, to the faith and love of Christ, which unite; from all that tends to alienation and partyism, to the unity and unity which apostolic teachings present. *There is one Body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all.* EPH. IV. 4-6.

IX. To sum up all in one paragraph: Christ Jesus is our all; without his Light and Love, we perish forever. His Divinity is our foundation; His life our example; His death our salvation; His resurrection our hope; His intercession our foundation of grace and mercy; His teachings our guide; His church our school; His Spirit our comforter; His gospel our reliance for the conversion of sinners; His commandments our life; His promises our rejoicing; so that through faith and obedience, we may be blessed with "all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ Jesus." To trust in the Lord Jesus, to love and obey Him—this is salvation here, and life eternal hereafter.

X. This declaration of our faith and aims is not to be taken as a creed. We assume no right to bind the conscience with any stereotyped formula. Vital religion is a thing of growth in the heart of the individual Christian. We design a mere statement, for general information, of the purpose which have induced us to band together, and the principles we propose to develop. We have no sectarian shackles with which to bind Christ's freemen—no spiritual prison-house for the confinement of the soul. We present no authoritative standard of interpretation of the Bible. The Spirit that indited the word, can best bring home to the heart the significance of its truths. The practice of the divine precepts, furnishes the best interpretation. We repudiate all human authority in spiritual concerns—*MATT. XXIII. 8-12. JOHN VII. 16, 17.*

May the God of grace and truth bless the reading of these pages, that they may assist in giving consistent views of the Gospel to the human inquirer, as well as in dissipating the prejudices of Christians; so that the former may be led to accept the salvation of God, and the latter be encouraged to seek after the simplicity of faith and unity of spirit, which belonged to the church of Christ before sects disturbed her harmony, or treacherous hands rent her seamless garment.

BY-LAWS.

For the Regulation of the Order and Business of the Church.

I. The affairs of the church shall be under the management of the pastor and those associated with him in office—they being re-

sponsible to the church therefor—except where any special business shall, at a business meeting, be assigned to a committee.

II. Any immersed believer, expressing a desire to unite with us in carrying out the objects of our organization, shall be entitled to membership, unless satisfactory reasons are known against his or her admission.

III. Members of the church, of both sexes, shall be allowed to participate in the social services of the church, and shall vote on all questions equally.

IV. At the meetings on the Lord's day, the services shall be conducted by the pastor and such brethren as may be invited by him to assist. At the business meetings, any member who desires may speak. While we wish to impose no arbitrary rule, it is nevertheless expressed, as the general sentiment of the church, that such speeches should not exceed ten minutes in length.

V. Regular business meetings of the church shall be held annually on the first Monday in January. Special business meetings may be called by the officers, at their own suggestion, or at the request of not less than five members.

VI. The pastor shall preside over the business meetings; or, in his absence, the senior officer present; or, in the absence of all the officers, any one who may be called to the chair by the members of the church present.

VII. No business meetings shall be held on the Lord's day.

VIII. All meetings shall be opened by reading the Scriptures and prayer, and closed by prayer.

IX. The order of business shall be:

1. Reading minutes of last meeting.
2. Report of the Secretary.
3. Report of the Treasurer.
4. Report of the Sunday School Superintendent.
5. Reports of Committees.
6. Miscellaneous business.
7. Reading and approval of the minutes.

X. The election of all officers, except Treasurer and Secretary—who shall be appointed by the Deacons—shall be by the church; a vote of at least two-thirds of the members being requisite to elect any one to office.

XI. Bishops and Deacons shall be elected to serve during good behavior; but they may be required to resign by a vote of two-thirds of the members of the church, or their resignation may be accepted by a majority vote.

XII. The salary of the pastor shall, from year to year, be fixed by the Deacons, subject to the approval of the church.

XIII. In matters of discipline, it shall be the duty of the officers of the church to investigate all charges regularly made, and report to the church their decisions for approval. In case of a decision, when approved by the church, being complained of as unjust by any party involved in said decision, upon request made by such party to the officers, the matter of complaint shall be referred to a committee mutually chosen from sister churches by the officers and the complainant, and the decision of that committee shall be acquiesced in as final.

XIV. The officers shall meet at least monthly for consultation on the interests of the church.

XV. It is understood that while we enter into these regulations, to preserve order and expedite business, the great law by which we propose to be governed in all our public and private intercourse, is the law of love.

XVI. Any member of the church, desiring to withdraw membership, whether the reasons for such withdrawal are approved by the church or not, shall be entitled to a certificate of his or her standing, at the time of such withdrawal.

XVII. In all matters of order in the business meetings, not provided for in these rules, the presiding officer shall be governed by the rules laid down in Cushing's Manual.

XVIII. No change shall be made in these rules, nor in the established order of the church, except by a vote of at least two-thirds of the members of the church; notice of said change to be given at least three months before the next regular business meeting.

CHURCH OF CHRIST,

Corner of Jefferson Avenue and Beaubien Street, Detroit,

ISAAC ERRETT, PASTOR.

Preaching every Lord's Day, at the usual hours of morning and evening service. Sunday School at 2, P. M. Communion service, 3, P. M. Prayer meeting Wednesday night. The public are respectfully invited to attend.

REMARKS ON THE FOREGOING.

THERE is not a sound man in our ranks who has seen the preceding "Synopsis" that has not felt scandalized by it. I wish we possessed even one decent apology for its appearance. It is a deep offense against the brotherhood—an offense tossed into the teeth of a people who, for forty years, have been working against the divisive and evil tendency of creeds. That it was meant as an offense by the brethren who have issued it, I cannot think. Still their work has a merit of its own, a merit which no lack of bad intention on their part can affect. Our brethren will accept this "Synopsis" for what it is, not for what it may possibly not have been designed to be. We are told that this "declaration" is not to be taken as a creed. But will this caveat prevent it being so taken? Never. When Aaron's calf came out had he called it a bird, still all Israel seeing it stand on four legs, with horns and parted hoofs, would have shouted a calf, a calf, a calf. The brethren

ren "meeting at the Corner of Jefferson Avenue and Beaubien Street, Detroit," may call their work in classic phrase a "Synopsis," or gently, a "declaration;" but we still cry a creed, a creed. It is not the mere title of a work that constitutes it a creed, but its matter and form, together with the manner in which it is issued and the sanctions by which it is accompanied. This "Synopsis" is a creed without the appropriate label—a genuine snake in the grass, wearing a honeyed name.

On its appearance in the *American Christian Review*, brother Franklin expressed his strong disapprobation of this "Synopsis;" while "John," in his burlesque of it, has left us in no doubt as to the estimate in which he holds it. With these sound men I fully agree, except in so far as they seem inclined to treat the "Synopsis" as a small matter. With the writer of this it has a painful significance—painful because symptomatic of the following items:

1. That some of our brethren have lost their former well grounded opposition to creeds, and are now ready to traffic in these unholy things. This indicates a diseased state of the body. How far this disease extends will be seen by the extent to which the "Synopsis" is indorsed.

2. That these brethren are no longer willing to be styled heretics for the truth's sake, but now wish to avoid that odium by adopting the customs and views of the sects of the day, and thus to become themselves a sect.

3. That what the world needs in order to learn the faith of these brethren is not the Bible alone, but the Bible and a "Synopsis of their faith and practice." With them, then, the Bible is an insufficient enlightener of the human family.

At these symptoms of degeneracy our brotherhood will feel something more than mere regret. They will feel profoundly ashamed. The church from which this "Synopsis" emanates was not long since written into most favorable notice by an article in the *Millennial Harbinger*, from the pen of Brother Pendleton. Besides, the church is tended, or as they perhaps would phrase it, presided over, by our accomplished Brother Errett. Had we not then a right, a reasonable right, to expect from a church thus favored something better than this wretched "Synopsis." Did these brethren pause to ask themselves what other saints in the ranks in which they stand would think of their deed? Or did they care what they would think of it? We much fear the latter question involves the truth in the case. They must have known the deep aversion of their brethren to creeds; and equally well did they know that this "Synopsis" would be regarded by them as a creed, though the contrary were avowed in a thousand forms. Still they published it. In what light then must we view it? In none, it

is shame enough to fear, save as the bold, defiant act of the church in Detroit to have a creed in despite of the faith and feelings of their brethren. There are several contingencies which combine to render the publication of this "Synopsis" just at this time not a little suspicious. But of these we shall not speak now.

It is proper, however, to notice the "Synopsis" more in detail. Let us then descend to particulars. In Article I, we have this remarkable "statement:" "We accept the Bible—Old and New Testaments—as the word of God."

Is it possible! We cannot believe it. That, "the church of Christ" in Detroit should accept the Bible, *id est*, Old and New Testaments, as the word of God distances our credulity. No "statement" however could have been more necessary for "the information of the public." But for this "statement," that stupid public would certainly have concluded that "the church of Christ" in Detroit accepts the Bible—Old and New Testaments"—as the mythic product of some defunct monk; or, what is far more likely, that "the church" does not accept it at all. The wisdom of the statement none can deny.

In Article II, we have the following: "While eschewing the metaphysical distinctions and technicalities of philosophies and creeds, on the subject of the Trinity, as being fruitful sources of confusion and strife among Christians, we recognize the tri-unity of the Godhead in the teachings of the New Testament."

If the latter part of this pompous "statement" is not a libel on the first part, then is it difficult to conceive the existence of such a thing. "We eschew the technicalities of creeds;" yet "we recognize the tri-unity of the Godhead in the teachings of the New Testament." We blush for the blindness and frailty which uttered this. But when men resolve to be unjust to the truth, and regardless of the feelings of their brethren, God has a singular way of making them appear contradictory and ridiculous. "We eschew the technicalities of creeds"—this was designed to be sand for the eyes of our brethren and a ground of amity: "we recognize the tri-unity of the Godhead in the teachings of the New Testament"—this is an humble petition to Orthodoxy to be permitted to return to her embrace. Surely she will not spurn the humble plea.

We cannot but regard "the church of Christ meeting on Beau-bien Street" as now and then peculiarly happy in some of its modes of thought and expression. "We recognize the tri-unity of the Godhead in the teachings of the New Testament." Whether this "church" believes in the tri-unity of the Godhead or not is adroitly enough not said. The presumption is, since the Bible—Old and New Testaments—is silent on the tri-unity of the Godhead, that "the church" does not believe it. All "the church"

does is to *recognize* the tri-unity of the Godhead in the teachings of the New Testament; but whether "the church" recognizes it as a thing sanctioned or a thing eschewed, we have no means of knowing.

Article III. thus sets out: "We regard the Divinity of the Lord Jesus as emphatically the Christian creed." Now let the reader not be deceived in regard to this statement. This is not the Christian creed; this is incense offered at the shrine of orthodoxy. Hitherto we as a people have said to the world, *the Bible is our creed*. But in this it seems we have been wrong. For *the Christian creed is the Divinity of the Lord Jesus*. Nay, more, it is "the truth to be believed; out of which, when believed, flows salvation to the sinner; out of which, also, spring the obligations, enjoyments, and hopes of spiritual life." It is not enough, then, to present simply the Bible as the Christian's creed, nor yet simply to believe that *Jesus is the Christ the Son of the living God*; neither is it enough to accept simply Christ as the way, the truth, and the life. No. All this is not enough; for the *Divinity of Christ is the Christian creed*. And further still, "in laboring for the conversion of sinners this" (the Divinity of Christ) "is the great theme." When, then, Philip went down to the city of Samaria and, in his labors for the conversion of sinners, preached simply Christ to the people, how grossly he blundered! For the great theme in laboring for this end is "*the Divinity of the Lord Jesus*."

But Article III, in the "Synopsis," is a prolific Article. It further says, "in accepting converts to baptism, the only confession of faith to which they are required to assent is, that Jesus is the Son of God, and the Anointed Prophet, Priest, and King, through whom we are to obtain wisdom, righteous sanctification, and redemption."

Hitherto we, as a people, have not been accustomed to regard persons as converted until they are baptized; but in "the church of Christ meeting on Beaubien Street," persons are first converted and then accepted to baptism. Detroit is the place in which to manufacture synopsis and make improvements. But the cumbersome confession to which these converts are required to assent is alike unknown to the Bible and to our brethren. It is, as a confession, a purely domestic piece, discreditable to its authors, degrading to those who assent to it, and an insult to the New Testament. How sublime to say, I believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son of the living God, in comparison with assenting to the preceding wordy collocation.

One of the first signs of degeneracy in Christianity is, that its modes of thought and forms of speech become distasteful to us. Tried by this rule, and "the church on Beaubien Street" has reason

to tremble. The mere fact that this confession is composed of words taken from the Bible, by no means constitutes it *the* confession of the New Testament. All the words of a sentence may be Bible words, and yet the sentence itself be false. Such is the case with this new-coined confession.

In Art. VI we have the following: "To such a believing penitent baptism is for the remission of sins, not as *procuring* or *meriting* pardon, nor yet as accomplishing spiritual regeneration; but as *bringing the believer into contact with Gospel promises*, and conveying to him a scriptural assurance of forgiveness."

A bold man would he be who should undertake to say what this means: "Baptism is for the remission of sins, *as bringing the believer into contact with Gospel promises*." Save the church and world, kind Saviour, from such nonsense. If this be not an instance of eclipsing the plain sense of holy writ by a meaningless exegesis, it would be hard to produce one. Baptism is for remission of sins in this sense—that the believing penitent is to be baptized in order to obtain forgiveness. The truth plainly told is a gain to the truth.

Let the reader turn once more to Art. VII. and read it a second time. This done, and we cite the following: "We do not wish, however, to place any obstacle in the way of any of the children of God who may desire to partake with us of the Lord's Supper, or to share in any of the privileges of Christian worship."

Whom, we now ask, is the expression "children of God" in this extract designed to embrace? Clearly those "who have honestly mistaken sprinkling or pouring for baptism." Such, then, are held by "the church meeting on Beaubien Street," to be Christians. "Baptism is for the remission of sins;" yet these persons have mistaken, sprinkling or pouring for baptism, and hence are not baptized. Yet, they are "children of God," Christians, plainly their sins are forgiven!

These honest persons have "mistaken sprinkling or pouring for baptism." They are hence not baptized. "Baptism is for the remission of sins." Their sins, therefore, are not remitted. Yet "we do not wish to place any obstacle in their way" if they "desire to partake with us of the Lord's Supper." Let this "church" never again use the word consistency; but rather let them henceforth hoist some sectarian banner and cry to the orthodox of the day, let there be no strife between you and us, we pray, for we are brethren. And further still, these unbaptized, and, therefore, unforgiven "children of God," if they desire to share in any of the privileges of Christian worship, must be permitted. They may sing and pray and preach "with us" though unbaptized, and no obstacle is to be placed in their way!

Again, in Art. VII. appears this statement: "Presuming not to judge those who have honestly mistaken sprinkling or pouring for baptism," &c. *Presuming not to judge them!* Certainly not; and yet you judge them to be "children of God." Nay, more, you adjudge them to be worthy to partake "with us of the Lord's Supper," and hence wish to place no obstacle in their way. "Presuming not to judge them!" And yet should the writer of this piece presume to judge them, you *i. e.* some of "the church meeting on Beaubien Street," would presume to judge him to be a bigot, and would be ready to separate from him in disgust. There is no charity so capricious and whimsical as that which is just setting out on its way to Rome.

In Art. VIII. "the church" in Detroit says, "we have been led, from a careful examination of the Scriptures, to the following conclusions:" and amongst others, they enumerate this one: "that every church when fully organized had a Bishop and Pastor, and frequently a plurality of Bishops." Not so, my brethren. No careful examination ever led to this conclusion. This one-Bishop and one-Pastor doctrine is incipient Popery, and no legitimate inference from the Bible. Celibacy and transubstantiation sprang from the same fertile source, and by the same licentious logic, from which this conclusion comes. Of course "the church" in Detroit has one Pastor and one Bishop. Now we humbly beg to add that it ought still to have an organ, a fiddle, a liturgy, and that its Pastor should wear surplice and be dubbed the *Rev.* so and so. Never again would "the church meeting on Beaubien Street" be disgraced by the charge of heresy; and surely the exemption would be cheap at the price.

In Art. X. "the church" says: "We present no authoritative standard of interpretation of the Bible. The Spirit that indited the word, can best bring home to the heart the significance of its truths."

Of course what the Spirit *can best do*, it and it only ought to do, and it alone does. *It therefore brings home to the heart the significance of its truths.* Let no one henceforward slander "the church" in Detroit, by denying that it believes in an influence of the Spirit distinct from and above the truth, a direct influence, an influence bringing home to the heart the significance of the truth. "The church" in Detroit is orthodox—thoroughly orthodox—on Spiritual influence. Neither Calvinist nor Arminian dare question its soundness more. Frail thing, how departs thy strength and glimmers away thy inconstant light.

On two points only is "the church" in Detroit not orthodox to excess. It is a little bigoted on baptism; but then since it "presumes not to judge those who have honestly mistaken sprinkling

or pouring for baptism," this point of difference may be fairly set down as not worth a pinch of snuff. Again, "the church" is a little testy on infant "membership." But then when these infants grow up, if they will only "honestly mistake sprinkling or pouring for baptism"—a thing they can most easily do—"the church meeting on Beaubien Street" will not presume to judge them, neither will it place so much as a single obstacle in the way of these "children of God should they desire to partake with us of the Lord's Supper." Besides, "the church" seems in a most relaxing mood just now; and no doubt the day is not distant when she will wholly abandon her naughty views on both these points. Then no "obstacle" can keep her from the amorous bosom of orthodoxy.

On the *by-laws* of "the church," a few thoughts seem in place. Indeed, we cannot consent to be so discourteous as to pass them in utter silence. These *by-laws*, note you, reader, are laws—positive, stringent decrees enacted by the church of Christ in Detroit. True they may be altered by a vote of two-thirds of the church; but then how rare a thing is it to get two-thirds of a church to vote on anything. These laws may be confidently pronounced more unalterable than was ever code of Mede or Persian. Whether "the church meeting on Beaubien Street" claims the power to alter the "rules laid down in Cushing's Manual," we cannot say. Cushing's Manual regulating the order of a "church of Christ" in its business meetings! Divine thought! My soul is in ecstasies over thee. Ye saints who for forty years have been struggling to return to the ancient order of things—see ye not where ye have blundered. How is it, ye slow bellies, that ye missed Cushing's Manual. I am wild with visions of reform. The Millennium, the Millennium—it is at hand; by Cushing's Manual it is here at a bound.

No. IV. of these *by-laws* thus limps off: "At the meetings on Lord's day, the services shall be conducted by the Pastor and such brethren as he may invite to assist."

Now, let no dog ope his mouth to aid in conducting the services of "the church of Christ" in Detroit in its meetings on Lord's day, unless the Pastor invite him to assist. Thus has "the church" enacted away its liberty, and with it, let us hope for its own sake, its shame and self-respect. The services *shall be conducted* by the Pastor. This smacks loud of the man of sin. When tyranny stalks thus into a church of Christ, reverence for the word of God and affection for the saints generally step out. That any church of Christ should ever so far disgrace itself as to bind on its neck a yoke like this, is one of the mysteries of human infr-

The brethren in Detroit owe it to themselves, and not less to the saints with whom they fraternize, to repudiate at once this "Synopsis," and to rescind these laws. That they have erred and wounded their brethren needs no proof. When they retrace their steps, we shall delight to honor them; but while they maintain their present footing, we must content ourselves to mourn their folly.

THE notion of a God is not contained in the notion of a mere First Cause; for in the admission of a first cause Atheist and Theist are at one. Neither is this notion completed by adding to a first cause the attribute of Omnipotence, for the Atheist who holds matter or necessity to be the original principle of all that is, does not convert his blind force into a God, by merely affirming it to be all-powerful. It is not until the two great attributes of intelligence and virtue, (and be it observed that virtue involves liberty)—I say, it is not until the two attributes of intelligence and virtue or holiness, are brought in, that the belief in a primary and Omnipotent cause becomes the belief in a veritable Divinity.—*Hamilton.*

ABRAHAM.—The great charm of Abraham's character, is its union of simplicity with grandeur. He rises like one of those great stones which are found standing alone in the wilderness, so quiet in their age, so unique in their structure, and yet on which, if tradition be believed, angels have rested, where sacrifices have been offered up, and round which, in other days, throngs of worshipers have assembled. His prayers pierce the heavens with the reverent daring of one of the mountain altars of nature. He is at once a shepherd, and a soldier. He is true to the living, and jealous of the honors of the ashes of the dead. He is a plain man, dwelling in tents, and yet a prince with men and God. Peace to his large and noble dust, as it reclines near that of his beloved Sarah, in the still cave of Machpelah. He was one of the simple, harmless, elephantine products of an age when it was not a "humble thing to be a man," and when all the "giants in those days" were not robbers and oppressors.—*Gilfillan.*

DISCRETION.—Though a man has all other perfections, and wants discretion, he will be of no great consequence in the world; but if he has this single talent in perfection, and but a common share of others, he may do what he pleases in his station of life.—*Spectator.*

SHORT ARTICLES FOR PERIODICALS.

It is not a little difficult to account for the prevalence, at particular periods, of certain notions or feelings which seize upon the public mind. Indeed, in many respects, they resemble an epidemic or mania, and in no respect more than this, that they seem to be governed by no law. All classes are affected by them; and there is no such thing as controlling them by reason or uprooting them by argument. Run their course they will. What renders them the more remarkable is, that although but a moments reflection would seem to be enough to correct them, still they maintain their footing. To this class of singular mental affections certainly belongs the feeling now almost universal, that we must have short articles for all our periodicals. I am far from thinking that I can, by any thing I shall say correct this pernicious notion; still I feel it my duty to call attention to it, in hope that I may thereby contribute something towards checking, at least, its mischievous tendency.

Why, let me ask, should it be thought, even for a moment, that all articles for periodicals ought to be short? No sensible answer can be given. Even where articles are bad, positively bad, it will never do to say they should be short. In that case they should not appear at all. But the shorter the article, we are told, the greater is the number who will read it. Be it so; is the reason good? I hold that it is not only not good, but that it is bad, utterly so. The reason implies either that readers have not the necessary time for reading long articles, or that they have not the necessary inclination. Suppose they have not the necessary time. Why have they not? Is it owing to the multiplicity of their religious duties? We know perfectly that it is not; for the Bible prescribes no such duties. Or is it owing to an overamount of worldly cares. Then readers are wrong, and the Bible condemns them; for it does not allow them to be thus overburthened. Or suppose readers have not the necessary inclination. Here again they are wrong. For the Christian owes it to himself and to his race patiently to cultivate his talents, and thereby prepare himself for the greatest possible extent of usefulness. If he be not thus inclined, this disinclination itself is wrong, and should be resolutely overcome.

But to this it may be replied again, that it is, nevertheless, *the fact*, no matter from what it springs, that the number who read short articles is, and always will be, greater than the number who read long ones. But does even this prove that all articles should

be short? I think not. For he who reads an article ten pages long, provided it is equally as good as an article one page long, has of course derived from his reading ten times more benefit than he who reads the one page, and is consequently that much better qualified for usefulness. Indeed, there is no such thing as defending short articles over long ones, except upon the ground that long articles are necessarily not as good for their length as short ones—a position which is certainly false. For articles have not their character as good or bad from their length, but from the quantity of matter they contain and the manner in which it is treated.

Clearly the length of an article should be determined by the nature of the subject of which it treats. If the subject be one of great magnitude, the article should have corresponding length. This is so obvious that merely to state it is enough. Again, the length of an article must depend very much upon the manner in which the subject handled in it is to be treated, that is, whether generally or minutely. Ordinarily few subjects can be rendered interesting when treated in a cursory or general way. Perhaps this is one of the very reasons for the existing large demand for short articles. In order to meet this demand, articles have to be so abbreviated, that usually, they contain little else than dry general remarks. Hence few take any interest in them. Indeed, about the only interest such articles possess is their brevity; no wonder, then, when this is the case, that men should demand still greater reductions in length. Yet strange that they should not see that precisely as they attain the end they demand, they fail to attain the end they seek. They seek profit in the articles they read; yet they demand that these shall be short. Hence in obtaining this, they lose that.

Reading short articles, in a few minutes, has several bad effects upon the mind, one or two of which I shall here point out. It helps to form the habit of giving to every subject only a brief superficial view. No habit is more fatal to deep, accurate knowledge than this. To derive the greatest possible benefit from any subject, it must be kept long and steadily before the mind, must be examined in all its parts, and these again viewed in their various relations one to another. This is never done when bestowing upon a subject only a hasty, general glance. Again, what is hastily read, especially if it be some short general view of a subject, is usually soon forgotten. The habit of constantly forgetting soon permanently injures the memory. Its records become dim, and the reading thereof untrustworthy. It hence becomes a chaos rather than the luminous, faithful conservator of the past it was designed to be.

Besides one of the chief ends of reading is wholly lost when a subject is compressed into a short article, abounding only in stale common-place remarks. No pleasure is awakened thereby. The appetite is not whetted by the reading. There are no long narrow defiles of thought to be threaded, with here and there sudden delights starting up. We never find ourselves loitering beside some unfrequented path, or pausing to indulge the luxury of some grand reach of thought. None of the bold gambols of fancy relieve the dull picture, nor is a solitary gush of pure tender sympathy ever met with. All is flat and tasteless. Sound sense and enlightened opinion alike depose that an article of corresponding length with the subject, wealthy in thought and suggestion, is the only true standard.

Again, in attempting to form an estimate of the length of articles, some account should be taken of the character of the publication in which the article is to appear. Weeklies, as a general rule, are both more hastily written, and hastily read than Monthlies. Hence, there is some reason for making the articles of the former shorter than those of the latter. The same relative difference exists between Monthlies and Quarterlies. Hence of all periodicals published, Quarterlies are, and for good reasons, expected to contain articles of the greatest length. To this rule the present work sees no reason for becoming an exception, either in the undue length of its articles or by yielding to an inconsiderate demand to make them all short. Its aim will be to avoid, as far as practicable, both extremes.

But we did not propose a long article in order to prove that all others should not be short. It is deemed enough merely to call attention to the subject without any very elaborate or formal discussion of it. With our brethren, thoughtful as they usually are, we trust the foregoing hints will be sufficient.

METAPHYSICAL PROBLEMS.—It enters into the definitions of metaphysical problems—that they are *universal*. To bring them, therefore, down upon one class of instances, to the exclusion of other instances, is an enormous solecism. To single out Christianity from the crowd of human affairs and interests, and to assail it, so singled out, with alleged demonstrations which, by their very nature, are equally true of all things, or false of all, is the same sort of proceeding, as if a mathematician, after demonstrating the properties of the triangle, were to apply his doctrine only to such triangles as are formed by the rafters and joists of a roof.—*Taylor*.

NOTE TO THE BROTHERHOOD.

It was expected that the Quarterly would be issued about four years ago; but circumstances which need not be detailed here, have delayed it until now. It at length makes its appearance in perilous times. Many will feel no doubt, that it should have been still longer postponed. This should certainly have been done, had the prospect existed of peace close at hand. But such is not the case. Instead, then, of deferring the work longer, it is believed that an obvious necessity exists for its immediate publication.

More now than ever before in this country, do even Christians need to be placed completely under the influence of Christianity. In mind and heart they are deeply and painfully agitated. Christianity alone can tranquilize and sooth them. In thought they are distracted and unsettled, and in affection alienated one from another. Truth alone can unitize, settle, and reassure them. Their zeal has cooled, their energy lost its ancient tone. Fresh, living pictures of the love of Christ, more than anything else, can rekindle the former, and vitalize the latter. Exciting political news so engrosses their attention that their views of the Gospel are in uncommon danger of becoming dim and unreliable. Nothing can so effectually prevent this as sharp, spirited discussions of the great elementary themes of Christianity. Indeed, never before did so high a necessity exist in our ranks for sound elementary preaching, and sound elementary writing as now. Let such preaching, and such writing, quick with the noble warmth of preacher and writer, be sent home to the hearts of the people, and salvation, and joy, and gladness will be the result. That it is the solemn duty of every true man to work for these great ends, surely none will deny. To these ends it was felt that the Quarterly might, in some humble measure, at least, be made auxiliary. Hence its appearance at the present juncture. The desire that when the war-god once more stills his clamor in the land, our body—that great body for whose growth and health some of us have now been long working—the desire that that body may be still one, with not a member lost, with truth maintained and honored, is the most absorbing passion of the poor heart that utters this. We have loved that body, and cherished it with the heart-warm love of the mother for her babe. And in return that body hath loved us much, loved us fondly, tenderly. We cannot desert it now in this hour of trial. No: we must work for it with pen, work for it with tongue, work for it with

prayer, work for it in hope, work for it the livelong day, and dream of it in watches of the night—work for it and never faint.

Beloved brethren: In the broad valley of the Mississippi, during the last forty years, our labors have been immense; and hitherto we have looked on them justly as a crown of glory. Much of this vast tract is this day dotted over by our own colleges, seminaries, meeting-houses, flocks in Christ, and homes. Worthy have been the hands that have toiled in this wide field, and honored the memory of such of them as sleep in its dust. Our numbers we now count by tens of thousands, with hopes the brightest that ever cheered the heart. No people ever had juster grounds of rejoicing than we, none ever had more at stake. Can we now afford to lose this great work? Can we even afford to have its brightness dimmed for a moment? Never, never. We must work heroically, and in every way to maintain what we have gained, and still work to gain more.

The sects of the day are doing nothing, literally nothing, save growling at one another as of old; while their members hate each other cordially on account of political differences. Let us be unlike them. We are setting them, in many places, a sublime example, and it is having its effect. They are beginning to realize that our plea of Christian union is not a mere pretense; but that, even in the trying present, we are living the thing we have been preaching to others. Even the world is taking lessons of us. Ages hence their effects will be seen. Let every brother, then, be alive to the grand work which God and his providences are calling him.

Be our high aims the following: To maintain, 1. The purity of the truth; 2. The unity of the church; 3. To cherish and disseminate a tender fraternal spirit—a spirit as ready and willing to forgive as it is to be forgiven.

In conclusion, we ask for the Quarterly the countenance and support of a noble brotherhood, as far only as it may subserve these great ends.

The old subscription list obtained four years ago has been thrown aside. All, therefore, who want the Quarterly, must subscribe for it anew. The subscription price is published on the outer cover.

LARD'S QUARTERLY.

VOL. I.

DECEMBER, 1863.

No. 2.

SPIRITUAL INFLUENCE AS IT RELATES TO SINNERS.

THE question of Spiritual Influence distributes itself into two parts, the first part relating to the sinner, the second to the Christian; and these two parts exhaust the subject as far as we are considered at present interested in it. Each of these two parts will form the theme for a separate article, the first part being the one treated of in the present paper.

The first thing to be noticed is the meaning of the expression, Spiritual influence. Few expressions are more common in religious circles than this, while none, perhaps, is used with less precision. The word influence, as will at once be perceived by many, is derived from the Latin terms *in* and *fluo*, which together mean *to flow into*. But is this the meaning of influence; Does it mean to flow into; and if so, what is the meaning of the expression Spiritual influence? Is it this: that the Spirit, the Holy Spirit, flows into a man's soul, as air flows into his lungs, or light into his eye? It will hardly be affirmed of the Spirit, that it is a fluent thing like a liquid or a stream. If not, what means the phrase Spiritual influence? I presume I state the general belief correctly, when I say that the word influence expresses *power* simply, while the term Spiritual is designed to be definitive both of the source of the power, and to some extent of the power itself. Since, then, the word influence denotes power, and the phrase Spiritual influence, power proceeding from the Spirit; and since this power is here considered in its relation to the sinner only, and in its relation to him only in his conversion, the phrase Spiritual influence may be still further defined to mean, *the power which the Spirit exerts on the sinner's mind in conversion*. From this, which I shall accept as correct, it will be perceived that I am here taking for granted that in conversion the Spirit does exert power on the sinner. On this point I wish to be distinctly understood.

Now in regard to the power thus exerted two questions arise. 1st. What is its nature? 2d. How is it exerted, whether some-

times *immediately* on the mind, or always through means? In regard to the first question, those who differ from us attempt no definition except such as is implied in the words peculiar, subtle, quickening, miraculous, and the like, used by them. But from even this much, one thing is clear, that they ascribe conversion to one influence while we ascribe it to a different one. What that different one is I stop not here to state. And in regard to the second question, they affirm that the power which effects conversion, be it what it may, is exerted sometimes *immediately* on the mind, though generally through means.

When, then, we take issue with them, how many, and what are the precise points involved? They are two, namely: 1st. That in conversion the Spirit exerts a peculiar, subtle, nay miraculous influence on the sinner's mind. 2d. That it sometimes exerts this influence *immediately* on the mind.

Such is a concise statement of the popular theory of conversion, both as respects the influence exerted therein and the manner of its exertion. Nay, unless I am mistaken, the influence here defined is, according to that theory, the only influence always really essential to conversion; the question being not whether conversion is effected by this influence, or some other, or by this influence and some other, but whether this influence, no other being allowed, is not sometimes exerted *immediately* on the mind, as well as generally through means.

Now, what is here affirmed both in the first point and in the second, I deny; that is, I deny, first, that in conversion the Spirit exerts on the sinner's mind the influence defined; and, second, that it exerts it immediately. Of course this second denial is implied in the first; for if the influence defined be not exerted at all, clearly it is not exerted immediately. But, though I deny both these points, I yet wish to deny neither without a qualification. Is it asked, then, if the Spirit has not the power to exert the influence defined in conversion? I reply that this is not denied, neither is it a point involved. Yet when denying the point which is involved, we are frequently represented as denying this which is not involved, and which no one denies. We are thus made, against our will, not only to occupy a false position, but, as it is profanely phrased, to limit the Spirit's power. We protest against the injustice. But again, since it is conceded that in conversion the Spirit exerts an influence of some kind, has it not the power, I may be asked, to exert that influence immediately? To this I reply as to the previous question: it is not a point involved. This like that is purely a question of power, respecting which, in the absence of divine light, we deny nothing.

But as both this and the previous question will be again noticed, I shall dismiss them for the present.

I am now prepared to examine the arguments or grounds on which the two points here denied are held, by those who affirm them, to rest. These grounds naturally divide themselves into three classes.

1st. The necessary, or such as tend to show the necessity of the influence defined in conversion.

2d. The Scriptural, or such as are designed to show that the influence defined is both that which is to be, and that which is exerted in conversion.

3d. The sensational, or such as are intended to establish by certain sensations, feelings, or mental states, that the influence defined has, as a matter of fact, actually been exerted in a given case.

These grounds will now be taken up in the order in which they are here stated.

I. The necessary. The arguments belonging to this class are two; both arguments from depravity, the one being general, the other special. I shall examine first the general argument. But that this may be done understandingly, I think it necessary to submit first a concise statement of what I deem to be the true view of depravity; and this statement seems the more necessary from the complete confusion in which the subject is at present involved.

Depravity means corruption; hence to be depraved is to be corrupted. A depraved nature, therefore, is simply a corrupted nature; and this is true whether the nature be physical or spiritual. Now there is but one thing in the universe that can corrupt a man in the sense in which the word corrupt is here used, to-wit—sin. But now by whose sin are we corrupted? I answer, both by Adam's sin and our own. Let not the reader be startled, but in patience hear me. Adam's sin corrupted Adam's nature—his whole nature. This cannot be denied. But to what extent has that sin corrupted us? I reply, so far precisely, of course, and so for only, as we have inherited Adam's nature. If Adam's nature was corrupted by his sin, and this has been conceded, and we inherit to any extent that nature, that we are to that extent corrupted by that sin, is as intuitively evident as it is that whatever corrupts the fountain corrupts the stream. But Adam's nature was Adam's flesh and Adam's spirit. To what extent do we inherit it? *We inherit his flesh, not his spirit.* All, then, that we inherit from him that has been corrupted by his sin is our flesh or body. But this much we do inherit from him; and hence to this extent have we been corrupted by his sin. But our spirits we inherit not from Adam. In them, therefore, is no corruption

derived from him. *Our spirits we inherit immediately from God.* They are, consequently, when first received, like their source, pure, absolutely pure. And not only so, they continue pure until we by our own actual sin corrupt them. Thus are we corrupted both by Adam's sin and our own. His sin has corrupted our flesh, our own sin corrupts our spirit. Only one thing more need be added. The depravity in the body is never remedied in this life. This takes place, in the case of the just, between the moment when the spirit leaves the body at death, and that when it re-enters it at the resurrection. The depravity in the spirit is remedied in the remission of our sins.

I am now prepared for the general argument, which may be thus stated:

Man is so depraved as to render the peculiar influence in question indispensable to his conversion.

This argument assumes not simply that man is depraved, but that he is depraved *so far*, that is, to such an extent, or *so much*, the word *so* being used to express either quantity, or extent, but which we are not told. It is, then, not simply depravity which creates the alleged necessity, but a certain degree of it. Man is *so* depraved as to render, &c. Had he been merely depraved, the necessity would not have existed; but he is *so* depraved that it exists. Now I am curious to know how the ecclesiastic mystics, who seem to be so accurately read in the subtleties of depravity, know whether it is depravity merely, or some degree thereof, which creates the necessity. They know perfectly, I grant, that it is some degree, but how they know it is the point which perplexes me. But to the argument. First, then, as to the flesh or fleshly nature of man, but little need be said. This, in the present life, remains wholly unchanged, either by natural or supernatural influences. It is generated, never regenerated. The most that can be said of it is, that by a strong will, and constant watching it may be kept under, but its nature is never changed. Hence in discussing the necessity for the influence in question, the flesh is to be left wholly out of view. But, second, is not man so depraved in spirit as to render this influence necessary to his conversion? It is so asserted I grant; but is it true? I do not believe it, nay I flatly deny it. But let me be understood. I am certainly not denying that man is depraved in spirit, provided he has actually sinned; but that he has thereby become so depraved as to render a supernatural influence necessary to his conversion, I do deny. No facts in the history of the spirit of which we can be conscious, warrant such an inference; the Bible does not assert it; and it is not an intuition. I consequently pronounce it false. But this is the essential feature in the argu-

ment in hand; and since this is denied or stands unproved, the argument is consequently utterly inconclusive.

Next the special argument, which may be thus stated:

Infants are depraved, and dying depraved would be lost. They are incapable of being reached by those moral influences which God has appointed to reach only adults. In their case, therefore, there is a special necessity for the influence defined in order to fit them for death.

That infants inherit a depraved body from Adam is admitted; but no change is needed in this to prepare them either for death or salvation. Hence in this life their bodies undergo no change. The change their bodies need is not a change to fit the infants for death, but a change to fit their bodies for glorification. This change will occur "when this mortal puts on immortality," and not before. And as to their spirits, since they inherit not these from Adam, they are hence free from all taint from his sin. Their spirits they receive pure from God; and as they never sin to corrupt them, they consequently remain pure; and hence need no change to fit them to return pure to him who gave them. Therefore, since the influence defined is in no sense necessary to prepare infants for salvation, the special argument which so assumes is false.

I must add that this argument derives not its force from the justness of its premises, its coherence, or its true conclusion. It affords the advocates of the peculiar influence in question an opportunity to play upon the ignorance, credulity, and feelings of parents, and thus to accomplish by dishonorable means what cannot be accomplished by an appeal to holy writ. In this lies its force.

II. The scriptural. As the arguments belonging to this class are numerous; and as a large majority of them are either wholly irrelevant, or have no tendency whatever to establish the question in debate, I shall confine my examination to such only as seem to be either the strongest, or to be the most relied on by the advocates of the influence in question. In selecting these arguments I shall confine myself to no one book or author, but shall take them indiscriminately from such as I may have at hand; and as they are peculiar to no single author, no one need be specially credited with them. Being thus attended by no name they will be left to stand or fall on their own merits.

1st. "Thrice in the year shall all your men children appear before the Lord God, the God of Israel. For I will cast out the nations before thee, and enlarge thy borders: *neither shall any man desire thy land when thou shalt go up to appear before the Lord thy God thrice in the year.*" *Exod. xxxiv: 23-24.*

The clause "*neither shall any man desire thy land*," is that, on which the argument is based. This clause, it is alleged, teaches that God intended, at certain periods, to interpose specially between the children of Israel and the surrounding nations, and by a direct and peculiar influence restrain the desires of the latter; that this implies not only that he can exert a peculiar influence directly on the mind, but that he actually does so whenever occasion requires, and therefore does so in conversion.

Now let all be granted, certainly, that the passage requires, namely: first, that God intended a special interposition; second, for the purpose of restraining in *some way* the desires of the people named. This much, perhaps, the passage teaches, but more than this it does not teach. That God did interpose in a given case and restrain the desires of a certain people, is a simple matter of fact. But *how* he interposed, whether *directly* or *indirectly*, and with what influence he restrained, are points neither asserted nor implied in the passage. Yet these are the very points essential to the argument; and since they are not established, the argument, is therefore, null.

2d. "The king's heart is in the hand of the Lord, as the rivers of water: He turneth it, whithersoever he will."

The argument based on this passage is briefly this: That the heart of every other man cannot be less in the hand of God than the heart of the king; and that as God turns the heart of the king as he pleases in merely worldly matters, he is surely far more likely to turn the heart of the sinner in conversion.

That the heart of every man is in the hand of God is certainly true; and it is equally true that he turns it as he pleases. But then comes the question *does he please* to turn, in the manner assumed, the heart of the sinner in conversion? This the argument does not prove, but merely takes for granted. The argument is intended to be one from analogy, assuming that as one thing is so, another which is like it must be so. But then God's controlling the heart of a king for purely political ends, and with no reference to his conversion, is by no means like his changing by a miraculous influence the heart of the sinner in conversion. Hence the fact that he does that by no means warrants the conclusion that he does this.

3d. "A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you, and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you a heart of flesh. And I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them." Ezek. xxxvi: 25-26.

The argument supposed to be warranted by this passage is this: That the expressions "take away the stony heart," "give

you a new heart," and "put a new spirit within you," denote a change identical with conversion; and that as they imply the exertion of extraordinary power; therefore, extraordinary power is exerted in conversion.

This argument may partake of the plausible, but conclusive it certainly is not. Indeed, defective as it obviously is, it does not deserve to be called even plausible. For it assumes merely that the change alluded to in the passage is identical with conversion. But of the truth of this there is no evidence. Indeed, there is no evidence that the change was not perfectly natural, and resulted from ordinary and familiar causes. The children of Israel were in exile in a land not their own at the time when the passage was spoken. There they had been subjected to great suffering and privations; and these had broken their proud hearts, and softened their obdurate spirits. Hence to them is to be ascribed the penitent and tractable disposition implied in the language of the passage. The argument is therefore defective in two respects, to-wit: in assuming, first, the identity of two facts which are distinct; and, second, that the former of these facts implies the exertion of extraordinary power—an inference which nothing in the fact itself, or in any circumstance connected with it, warrants.

4th. "But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord: I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts: and I will be their God, and they shall be my people." Jer. xxxi: 33.

The argument founded on this passage is the following: That the Holy Spirit is the agent who is to put the law of God in the mind, and write it on the hearts of his people; and that such is the nature of this work that nothing save the hidden, miraculous energy of the Spirit can effect it.

Now we have no hesitancy in granting that the Holy Spirit is the agent by whom this work is done; but then comes the question, how is he to do it? To this the argument replies: by his hidden, miraculous energy. But where is the proof of this? Certainly not in the passage. If then, it exists at all, it must be in the nature of the work to be done; and this the argument assumes to be so. Its language is: such is the nature of this work, that, &c. But wherefore this language? It serves neither to define the work, nor any other important end. Its sole effect is to confuse; still it has its value. The expression, such is the nature of the work, is a mere assertion unsupported by evidence. Besides, if not ambiguous, it certainly is indefinite. The word such may not only embrace much more than the fact asserted in the passage, but it may imply a work by no means therein contained; and this is the precise reason for using it. It diverts

attention from what the passage does say, to what in fact it does not say, and from the work it really expresses, to one of which it knows nothing. Thus, from its use the reader is apt to infer that a work is to be done which really requires the hidden, miraculous energy of the Spirit, when nothing is farther from the truth.

But what is the work of which the passage speaks? It is simply to put the law of God in the mind, and write it in the hearts of his people; in other words, it is to cause them to know his will, and to be deeply impressed by it. To accomplish this, just two things are necessary: 1st. To publish his law in an intelligible form. 2d. To attend it by such proofs of its divinity, and such sanctions as shall forever engrave it on the human heart. All this God has done; and beyond this nothing more is needed. By his Spirit speaking through prophets and apostles, he has made his law known; and by the terms in which they express it, is it written on the mind; while by every circumstance clustering around immortality and eternal life is it impressed on the soul. No hidden and miraculous energy, therefore, is needed to effect the work.

Four arguments from the Old Testament have now been adduced and examined; and of the class which it supplies these may suffice. These arguments, together with the Scriptures on which they are founded, are relied on with great confidence by the advocates of a secret, miraculous energy in conversion. Yet not one of these arguments is sound. On the contrary, they are all found to be defective in some vital point: while not one of the Scriptures contains the doctrine they are so often cited to establish. Indeed, had the public mind never suffered itself to be preoccupied with the impression that the Bible teaches, on the subject of Spiritual influence, what in reality it does not teach, these Scriptures would never have been abused as they have been; nor arguments based on them to which they lend no sanction.

I next proceed to examine arguments founded on Scriptures of the New Testament; and here, as in the preceding case, shall examine only a fair sample of those ordinarily used. These, however, shall be such as I deem the strongest. The first I notice is based on the following passage:

5th. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." John iii: 6.

The argument held to be warranted by this passage is the following: The clause, "that which is born of the Spirit is spirit," implies, first, that in conversion the human spirit itself undergoes a deep vital change. Second, that this change results from an influence peculiar to the Spirit, which is, therefore, secret and

almighty. Hence, such an influence is ever present in conversion.

With one point at least in this argument I most cordially agree, namely: that in conversion the human spirit itself undergoes a deep vital change—not of course a change in its fabric and structure, but in its conceptions, convictions, and affections. On the importance and necessity of this change, my brethren most earnestly and uniformly insist. Nor can serious objection lie against the statement that this change results from an influence peculiar to the Spirit. Still the statement needs qualification. The epithet, peculiar, is no definition of the influence exerted, though designed, no doubt, so to be. It merely determines the source of the influence—the Spirit. The words secret and almighty are the definitive words, but whether truly and adequately, I stop not to question. One thing however is clear, that in the use of these two words lies the weakness of the argument. They have no warrant in holy writ. On what ground, I ask, is it asserted of the influence which effects conversion, that it is secret, and almighty? None, certainly, save the tenet of him who so asserts. Since, therefore, the argument is defective in its most vital part, it is hence void.

Here I must pause long enough to notice what I conceive to be a most serious blemish, in all the arguments I have seen on the affirmative side of a miraculous influence in conversion. They abound in superfluous epithets. The words mysterious, secret, hidden, miraculous, almighty, etc., encumber more or less every proposition on the subject. Yet they neither add strength nor perspicuity to the propositions in which they are found. Their only effect is to confuse the unthinking and ill-taught. They describe no known attribute of the subject about which they are employed. High sounding they may be, but legitimate and expressive they are not. Their use is altogether loose and indiscriminate.

6th. "Then opened He their understanding that they might understand the Scriptures." Luke xxiv: 45.

From this the following is alleged to result: The Saviour opened the understanding of the disciples by exerting his divine power immediately on their minds. The understanding of all needs to be opened in the same way in order to conversion. Therefore in conversion divine power is exerted immediately on the minds of all.

Few arguments on the subject in question, are more specious than this; and perhaps none is better calculated to deceive. Its power lies in this, that it is partly true and partly false; and the part that is false is received on the credit of the part that is true.

It is certainly true, as I conceive, that the Saviour opened the understanding of the disciples by exerting his divine power immediately on their minds. The case, in brief, was simply a miracle. But these disciples were not to be converted; neither was this the initiation of a rule thereafter to govern conversion, nor an instance of work done under one at that time governing it. It was a special case for a special purpose. Hence it can neither be used as a premise in argument, nor is it to be regarded as proving anything respecting conversion.

The minor premise of the argument is an assumption. No evidence exists that the minds of all need to be opened in order to conversion, as were the minds of those disciples. The argument therefore contains an invalid feature which proves fatal to it. Its conclusion is hence devoid of truth.

7th. "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness to him; neither can he know them because they are spiritually discerned." 1 Cor. ii: 14.

The argument deduced from this passage may be concisely stated thus: Man in his natural or unregenerate state will not receive, neither can he know, the things of the Spirit of God. For this the Spirit itself must prepare him by exerting immediately on his mind its divine influence. But this preparation is conversion. Therefore in conversion all receive a divine influence immediately from the Spirit.

If we except John iii: 8, perhaps not another passage in the New Testament is relied on more confidently than the foregoing to establish the question in hand, nor a single argument deemed more conclusive than the one just stated. It will, therefore, be necessary to bestow on both passage and argument a little more than ordinary attention.

First, then, who is the natural man? I answer: Man as he is by nature, reasoning according to principles pertaining to this life only, the man who rejects Christianity. In this sense of the term we have hundreds of natural men in our midst. They are those men who, rejecting revelation, fall back on their own unaided reason as the sole standard of right and duty. But specially the term in the passage has reference to the freethinkers of Corinth who rejected the gospel. But now comes the question, did they reject the gospel because the Spirit had not fitted them to receive it? So implies the argument, and if truly, then they rejected it from necessity, and not from choice. They did what they could not but do; and hence were guilty of no sin. This is a hard nut for the advocates of the question in hand. But in this respect I believe the argument to assert not truly. They rejected the gospel, not because the Spirit had not fitted them for it, but

because they deemed it foolishness. The gospel had been submitted to them, they subjected it to the test of human reason, and human experience (the human standard of wisdom) merely as these pertain to an affair of the present life; and not being able to account for it or solve its deep problems on this ground, they rejected it. They rejected it, not because they were not prepared for it; *but because they reasoned amiss*. The cause of rejection lay in their logic, not in their want of preparation. But on the very ground on which they rejected it, they might, nay would, have received it, had they not abused that ground. They rejected it because they thought it foolishness, that is, because they reasoned amiss; and this clearly implies that they would not have rejected it, but received it, had they not thought it foolishness, which they would not, had they reasoned correctly. For this abuse of their reason they were certainly responsible; for he who cannot use his reason correctly, cannot abuse it; and the ability to use it correctly, implies the duty to do so. I hence conclude that they rejected the gospel for the same reason, precisely, that thousands now reject it—because they reasoned erroneously respecting it, and not because they were unprepared by the Spirit for it.

Second. What means the phrase, “the things of the Spirit of God,”—τὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος τοῦ Θεοῦ? I reply: the things revealed by the Spirit to the apostles, and which they preached—the gospel. Of the correctness of this there is not, I believe, allowed to be a doubt.

Third. But now in what sense was it that the natural man *could not*, (it is the language of impossibility), know these things? To bring this point out still more clearly, there was one thing which the natural man could and would have done, but for his faulty reasoning—receive these things; but there was another thing which he could not do, whether he reasoned correctly or not—know the things of the Spirit of God. In what sense, then, could he not know them? The answer is, he could not know them as Paul knew them—know them at first-hand—know them as matters immediately revealed to him by the Spirit. The Apostle’s language is, “now we,” (i. e., inspired men), “have received, not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God, *that we might know the things* that are freely given to us of God.” Again, “God hath revealed them (these things) to us by His Spirit.” It was in this sense that the natural man could not know these things. There was one department of knowledge from which God had shut him out, though this perhaps he denied; and another to which he had shut him in. From that knowledge which consists in knowing these things as immediate revelations from the Spirit, he, not having the Spirit, was of course excluded;

and at the same time he was shut in to that knowledge which consists in knowing these things at second-hand, that is, as matters first revealed to the apostles, and then communicated by them to us, to all. From this primary knowledge all are excluded save inspired men; but from the secondary, none are excluded, save those to whom the gospel has never been sent. It was on this knowledge at second-hand, (none the less real and important, however, on that account), that the natural man reasoned, and which he rejected; and on which all must now reason who reason on any, and receive or be lost. To receive this knowledge two things, and two only, are necessary. 1st. To present "the things of the Spirit" to the mind in an intelligible form; and this has been done in the gospel. 2d. To bestow upon them a just, earnest, and sufficiently protracted attention. Hence no immediate, special, divine influence is necessary.

Fourth. But what means the phrase, "spiritually discerned," or discerning things spiritually? It means to discern that certain things are from God, through the agency of the Spirit acting immediately on the mind of an inspired man. It has no reference to ordinary men discerning, by some secret impulse of the Spirit, the hidden meaning of holy writ. The Scriptures contain no such meaning; neither is any meaning, hidden or not, ever discerned in this way.

But to return to the argument. 1st. The natural man will not receive the things of the Spirit. Certainly not, if he decides them to be foolishness. But he will not decide them to be foolishness, provided he reasons correctly respecting them; and this he not only can do, but is bound to do without any special, secret aid from the Spirit. On the contrary, whenever he reasons correctly respecting these things, he will see that they constitute the highest wisdom, and involve his weightiest interests; and then will he receive them. 2d. Neither can he know them. In one sense he cannot, in another he can, as already explained. 3d. To receive and know these things the Spirit must prepare him by exerting immediately on his mind its divine influence. Of the truth of this holy writ knows nothing. It is a groundless assumption. Here, therefore, the argument shows itself to be utterly false. Hence I need proceed with it no farther.

8th. "I have planted, Apollos watered, but God gave the increase." 1 Cor. iii: 6.

Of implied arguments, this passage is supposed to furnish one of the strongest. It may be thus stated: In the preaching of Paul and Apollos to the Corinthians, the whole of all influence which is merely human, with the whole that belongs to the truth, was exerted on them. Yet to both these God had to add another

influence in order to "give the increase;" and this added influence, which was invisible and miraculous, is the true influence of conversion; and is, hence, ever present in it.

In order to reply justly and successfully to this argument, the first thing to be done is to determine the precise application and meaning of the expression, "God gave the increase." This done, all else will be easy.

Now, certainly the expression applied to the Corinthians; but when, and to what in them? Did it apply to them at the time of their conversion and denote a part of it? Such would seem to be the view of the argument, though I think it unquestionably wrong. To the Corinthians Paul says: "ye are God's husbandry," that is, what he cultivates, his crop. Again, "I have planted," planted you, the crop; and *this planting embraced their conversion*. Hence, whatever influence was employed in their planting, was that which effected their conversion. But what was that? Paul says, "in Christ Jesus I have begotten you *through the gospel*." Now that begetting them, and planting them, though different figures and different expressions, are yet identical in sense, I do not allow to be doubtful. Hence as the gospel was the influence employed in begetting them, it was also that which was used in planting them: and consequently, that which effected their conversion. Now it was this crop thus planted by Paul, these Corinthians thus begotten, converted, by him, that Apollos watered—exhorted, comforted; and it was this crop thus planted and watered that God caused to grow. In other words, it was these Corinthians thus converted and comforted that God caused to prosper in the divine life and increase. Hence the expression, "God gave the increase," has no reference to their conversion, but to their subsequent prosperity as Christians.

However, I must not forget that the sectarian mode of construing the expression is this: That Paul planted the seed, the word, in the hearts of the Corinthians, Apollos watered it, but God by his invisible, divine energy caused it to grow. But the Apostle holds no language which warrants this; besides it is inconsistent with the several figures under which he treats their conversion. He says to them, "ye are God's building," and as such they had a foundation, and on it had been built. This foundation Paul himself had laid, while he and others had built them on it. Again, "ye are God's husbandry"—crop. This crop Paul had planted but others were tilling. It seems to me, therefore, clear that when he says "I have planted," his meaning is, I have planted you, the crop, and not I have planted the word in you.

With these premises before us we can now, in few words, dis-

pose of the argument. It is at fault in three respects: First, in assuming that the expression, "God gave the increase," applies to conversion; second, in stating that God ever adds to the word a secret energy to give it efficacy; and, third, in presuming to define what the specific influence is, which is added, when, even allowing that any is added, it is impossible to know precisely its nature or kind.

Now from the foregoing remarks, let no one suppose that I wish to impair the force or ignore the meaning of the remark, "God gave the increase." Such supposition would be most unjust. I profoundly believe that when a Christian preacher plants a "husbandry" or crop for God, that he both by his Spirit in the converts and by his gracious providences nourishes it and causes it to grow. This with me is a cherished and precious faith.

9th. "And you hath he quickened who were dead in trespasses and sins." Eph. ii: 1.

From this passage the following is deduced: The Ephesians before conversion were dead in sins, and hence as incapable of being converted by any merely moral influence as though literally dead. The influence therefore which converted them must have been miraculous. Consequently a miraculous influence is necessary to conversion.

To be dead in sin, is not to be absolutely dead, but only relatively so. It is to be dead to righteousness, no more. He who is dead in sin is at the same time alive to sin: he is sinning while dead in it. Neither is it true that he who is dead in sin cannot be reached by moral influences; for even the temptation to sin, whether arising within him or existing without him, is a moral influence. This influence he can resist or not as he will; and it is this which renders him responsible. Further, he who can resist one moral influence can also resist another, nay all others; otherwise he is so far the creature of necessity, and not a moral agent. He can hence resist converting influence which is moral. Nor is the fact that this converting influence can be resisted any proof of its absolute want of adequacy. For in and of itself it is adequate; yet not in all cases. But why? Not because of any want of power in it, but because of the resistance offered. Nor could the case be otherwise and the unconverted be guilty. For if converting influence were irresistible, then non-conversion would be necessary, and hence no sin.

Now it is very true that the Ephesians previous to conversion were dead in sins; but it does not thence follow that they could not be converted by moral influence. This is a nonsequitur.

Neither is there any evidence before us that the influence by

which they were converted was miraculous. Certainly the passage asserts nothing of the sort, neither does it imply it. The argument is hence not only unsound, but its conclusion is false.

Nine arguments belonging to the class called Scriptural have now been examined. To these several more might be added but without either interest or profit. Like those now tried they are invalid in some respect. Indeed, no sound argument has ever yet been constructed in defense of the hypothesis of a miraculous influence in conversion. The hypothesis itself is false, hence a sound argument in its defense is impossible. I now proceed to the last class of arguments.

III. The sensational. After all, I believe it may be truly affirmed that the evidence of feelings is that chiefly relied on in the present controversy. That it is the sole evidence of the common people can hardly be denied. Indeed it would be difficult to over estimate the stress laid on it, or the confidence with which it is appealed to. But let the point to be established by it be again stated. It is this: In conversion the Holy Spirit exerts a peculiar influence immediately on the mind. Such is the point to be established by the evidence in question—the evidence of feelings or mental states. Is the evidence adequate to the end?

But first do these feelings or mental states really exist? Upon this question I must not only be explicit, but do my brethren a piece of justice which has seldom been done them by dissentients in the present controversy. When denying that feelings are competent evidence to establish the point in issue, we are frequently represented as denying the feelings themselves, that is, denying their existence. But this is not true. That these feelings or mental states really exist, we frankly grant. Indeed their existence as a fact we could not deny without invalidating the highest form of evidence known to the human mind. Their existence is a fact lying immediately under the eye of consciousness whose peculiar function it is to take notice thereof and avouch it to the world. What is thus taken notice of and avouched we cannot deny; and hence cannot deny the existence of these feelings. Should any one affirm himself to be conscious of these feelings when he is not so, this is a different question, and one which we are not considering. Nay more, we not only admit the existence of these feelings in those from whom, on other points, we yet differ; but maintain that they exist in us as really as in them; and since we affect not to deny their existence in others, we claim that their existence shall not be denied in us. Furthermore, against these feelings as such, or against the legitimate play thereof, we have never either thought or spoken a word. When, then, we have objected to feelings at all, and this we have

certainly done, and still do, what is the exact point objected to? I reply, first, to the *excess* of these feelings; and, second, to the *unlawful use* of them. When feelings are kept pure and within due bounds, to object to them is to object to one of the kindest provisions of nature. We know what melancholy pleasure, even in our present ruined state, often trembles in the briefest emotion of the soul; and what strange, deep delight is to be felt in the flow of holy feelings. Without these emotions and feelings the bosom of man would be as devoid of happiness in this life, as is the empty cask of life and delicious music. It is not to such feelings and emotions as these that we object. But when feelings come blubbling up from a mere pot of flesh, when they are allowed to riot high over reason, to dim the eye of intuition and disturb the balance of judgment, then loud and strong we lift our voice against them. If any one wishes to know more particularly what we object to when we say we object to the excess of feelings, let him attend a "revival season" in one of our orthodox churches. Here vociferous prayers and wretched music are mingled together, while screams, and groans, and heartless amens complete the chorus; palms are clapped and rubbed, benches leaped, backs pounded with huge fists, eyes glare, while now and then the farce is relieved by the brainless "holy laugh." Yet a scene like this is called a "happy time;" and all who take part in it declare they "feel so good." It is to the feelings displayed in a scene like this that we object.

But the point to which we chiefly object is the use made of these feelings. Can the sinner know that the holy Spirit has spent a peculiar influence immediately on his mind by his feelings? The popular parties of the day, with, perhaps, not an exception, reply he can. Let us now examine this answer, together with the process of reasoning which it implies.

First, then, the feelings exist. This, as already said, is granted. Now in what cause did they originate? The orthodox parties of the day say, *in the Spirit*. This we deny. The real question then between them and us is not a question as to the existence of feelings, but a question as to what caused them. That their existence as an effect readily suggests the presence of *some* adequate cause, I frankly grant; but that they have any power to suggest specifically the Spirit as their cause, is not true. Upon one condition only can these feelings be used to establish an immediate Spiritual origin. Were it first settled as a fact that they can originate in nothing except the Spirit, then of course their existence would establish an immediate spiritual cause. But this is not settled, neither can it be. Certainly they are not intuitively perceived to originate in the Spirit, neither does the

logical faculty so deduce them. I hence conclude that the popular use of these feelings is wholly unwarranted.

But it is further argued that the *character* of these feelings points to a Spiritual cause. This argument, however, is really implied in the foregoing; and since there disposed of, need not be further noticed. It assumes that feelings of the character in question can have no other than a Spiritual origin. But this cannot be assumed. It must be proved, otherwise it amounts to nothing.

But these feelings or mental states actually exist as a matter of fact. Are we not, then, bound to account for them, since we reject the account of our opponents? I answer, we are not unconditionally so bound, since no one can be unconditionally bound to do what in many cases is impossible, namely: assign the true cause of a given effect. Yet this much we do feel bound to do; we feel bound to assign a more rational and satisfactory account of their origin, as we conceive, than the one we reject. In what then do they originate?

It occurs to me that an answer to this question to a high degree satisfactory, especially to those who dissent from us in the premises, may be found in their own conduct, which certainly appears to be strikingly at variance with their theory. They hold that the Spirit is, if not the sole, certainly the immediate cause of these feelings; and that, without its presence, no matter what efforts may be made, or causes set to work, they cannot be generated. But is there any rational correspondence between their theory and practice? We think none. Now, as serving the purpose both of a proof and an illustration of what is here said, I shall cite the following case:

It was proposed in one of the most exemplary and intelligent of our orthodox churches to hold a protracted meeting, with a view to a revival; and the question arose as to the choice of a preacher. The name of Enoch Jones was first proposed, and his fitness for the occasion canvassed. On inquiry it turned out that Enoch was a man of extremely unprepossessing personal appearance. Indeed many boldly avowed that he was the exact counterpart of Willie Wastle's wife, that dwelt on Tweed. Be this as it may; he yet had gifts, if not graces. His scholarship was highly respectable, his acquaintance with Scriptures extensive and minute; and he was confidently pronounced one of the finest logicians of the day. He stated a proposition with marvelous clearness; while his illustrations were absolutely beautiful. In style he was fluent and chaste, while his discourses were frequently relieved by the most delicate touches of classic lore. To which is still to be added, that his character and piety were fault-

less. But then Enoch's manner was perfectly icy, not one ray of warmth or sympathy being ever felt to gleam through those cold, crackling sentences. No spark of feeling in any human breast was ever enkindled by him. The vote was taken on Enoch Jones' case. Not a hand went up in his favor. Is not this significant? The work to be done is the work of the Spirit; yet peculiar human agency is sought. How strange it is that the Spirit will not work with Enoch Jones. The case would be suggestive if it did.

But next the name of Jonathan Tompkins was proposed. Every delighted voice cried out—*the very man*. Now Jonathan was an honest man; and though no great scholar, he was yet peculiarly fitted for a revival occasion. His personal appearance was fine, his port confident and commanding. His voice was liquid, sweet, and penetrating; he sang like an eolian harp, and could exhort from morn till noon, and noon till night. He abounded in anecdotes, each one of which in itself was enough to break your heart, but in the lips of Jonathan Tompkins it became resistless. His pure, melting sympathy was exhaustless; and when he wept it was as if his soul was bursting. To hear Jonathan Tompkins repeat the charge of a dying Christian mother to her wayward boy, would move anything but a fiend. And then when he stood by the cradle of an expiring babe, and lifted its thin, tiny hand and pressed it close to the cheek of its mother, when he imprinted that last kiss, and uttered that last, low, sweet childish adieu, "dood by mamma," I declare it was overwhelming.

But then Jonathan Tompkins could rise to higher themes than these. I have never yet heard a man whom I deemed equal to the task of sketching the closing scene of the Saviour's life. Jonathan is one of the very few who should ever attempt it. When he draws that picture the effect is positively tragic. You actually forget that you do not see those burly soldiers plating that crown. Their very fingers work in your eyes as thorn after thorn completes the instrument of pain. Close by sits the meek and gentle Saviour, anxious and careworn from the illtreatment of the past night; but not a murmur escapes his lips. At length a ruffian spits on him; and you see the filth on his sacred form. Another gives him a heavy blow, the flesh reddening beneath it; yet he utters no word of complaint. But that crown is done. You see it fitted to his head, pressed down and pressed again. The blood comes oozing from that pure brow, and goes trickling over his face, dropping on that seamless coat. Your anguish of soul is intense. That huge cross is next laid on him. He reels beneath it, but slowly moves away. Lower and lower still he

bends under the load, till prostrate he falls to the earth. You listen to hear angels shriek as they snatch him up and bear him hence. But from him you hear not a sigh. Slowly he rises, and soon stands near that upraised cross. A rude soldier now clutches his arm and straightens it. The back of his open hand lies against the fatal wood; and you hear a quick, husky voice saying *δός μοι ῥήλον*—give me a nail. A heavy hammer swings round, you hear a crash, and that nail has gone tearing through that hand to its head. All along up that extended arm you see the flesh quiver and jerk. Yet no plaint is heard. Slowly his head begins to droop on his manly bosom. Your spirit is in agony. You long to stand beside that deserted friend of man, to hold that sinking head, wet those hallowed lips, smooth back that hair, stroke that divine forehead, and speak just one kind word to that lone sufferer.

But ah, reader, this is not plain, honest Jonathan Tompkins himself; this is talk about him. To appreciate him you must hear him and see him yourself, and not merely hear of him. But Jonathan was called to conduct that meeting. I need scarcely add that he did his work, and did it well. *The deepest feelings were produced.* The question is what caused them? The church declares that it was the Spirit. We think it was the preaching of Jonathan Tompkins. Reader, what say you? But waiving anything further on the acting and scenic portion of Jonathan's efforts, let us attempt to compute the several elements of power that entered into his preaching. Perhaps these may serve somewhat to justify our conclusion.

First. There was the distant end to be achieved—the salvation of the immortal spirit. No grander theme than this is known, nor any that can move the soul deeper when it is skillfully handled. He who cannot be awakened by it, lies dead in the shadow of death, and the chains of perdition are on him.

Second. The fear of hell. However much even Christians may seek to disguise it, we all fear the place; and I doubt whether our devotion would be anything like as ardent as it is, but for the quickening effect of this tremendous cause. That it is a large and active element in arousing the feelings of the sinner, none can deny who is familiar with its frequent and successful use.

Third. The contagiousness of sympathy. Of the mysterious nature of human sympathy we may know but little; but of its subtle and diffusible power we all know much. There is no cause that sports so with human feelings as this; nor any that moulds them so readily into its own multiform image. That sympathy of a specific type begets its like, unless resisted by the most powerful efforts of the will, is a fact attested by universal experience.

When, then, a congregation of good men and women, such as I am now alluding to, allows its feelings to become highly excited by the fervent preaching of a man like Jonathan Tompkins, who is there that can sit in its midst, with no inclination to resist, and not absorb its feelings until he becomes excited quite as deep as the most excited? Indeed, unless my observation is much at fault, human sympathy may be set down as the chief cause of all those feelings and mental states of which I am speaking. Through it more than through anything else, is felt the influence of friends and kin—no mean influence in a revival.

Fourth. The desire to be with the good in the church. All love society, and the purer the society, the deeper is the love. It is God's own plan to group the good together, hence all pure and holy instincts and desires tend to the same end.

Fifth. The still more absorbing desire of all to be prepared for death. The solemnity of this consideration gives it a peculiar significance as an element in preaching. When borne home to the heart in the earnest pleading style of Jonathan Tompkins, few are proof against it.

Now all these are so many distinct elements tending, when in hands that know how to use them, to arouse the deepest feelings of the human soul. That they are adequate to this, fully so, none can deny who has ever felt their combined influence. I hence conclude them to be the true cause of all those feelings in professors ascribed by them to an immediate agency of the Spirit. Not only so, I conclude them to be the sole cause of those feelings. The truth of this may be strikingly shown by merely withholding these elements when it is desired to produce those feelings. No matter how strong may be our faith in the supposed immediate influence of the Spirit, or how earnestly we may desire its exertion, still without the elements just enumerated those feelings are never excited. It would be difficult to determine the precise cause of a given effect with higher certainty than we here determine preaching, with its included elements, to be the cause of the feelings in question. I hence feel doubly assured that my conclusion is right.

But in reply to this it will be argued, that preaching, with its included and attendant circumstances, is not the cause of these feelings, but merely the means through which the real cause, the immediate influence of the Spirit, acts. This, however, is no argument, but a mere statement of the case. Besides, it rests on no authority. It is the popular mode of explaining what has no higher sanction than the popular voice. It is consequently entitled to no further notice.

The several grounds upon which the doctrine of an immediate,

miraculous influence in conversion rests, have now been examined. The question therefore is finally submitted to the candid decision of the reader. When these grounds are calmly weighed in the light of true reason, a single sentence will tell the result: *The doctrine they are designed to support is wholly false.*

I come now to state what I deem to be the correct view of Spiritual influence, the Scriptural view; or, if it be not offensive, the view held by my brethren, together with some of the grounds which are believed to warrant it. I say some of the grounds, for it is not proposed to notice all of them. The subject is one of great magnitude, the full discussion of which would require a volume. Still we hope to treat it not with injurious brevity even in the narrow space we propose to allot to it.

In the outset we wish to say that we as a people cherish no special affection for the discussion of this theme; nor are we convinced that the constant agitation of it to which the religious world at large is addicted, is not injurious. Our position from the first has been to preach Christ, and not the Holy Spirit. The large space assigned the subject in pulpit oratory and religious literature, has diverted thought from Christ to an extent so great that faith in some peculiar view of Spiritual influence rather than in him is made the test of acceptance with God.

Again, the subject for the most part confessedly lies far within the region of the mysterious and inscrutable. Shortsighted as we all are in this life it is hazardous to enter upon the discussion of such matters. We are soon deeply plunged into metaphysical speculations, the result of which, too often, is the construction of an airy creed of great rigidity to which all must consent or be written down as heretics. Had we been left to our own choice we should never have given the subject the prominence it now occupies in the public eye. We should have been content to hold in a faith of great strength all the Scriptures teach on it, and to teach the same most distinctly and fully; but here we should have paused. But with this our opponents would not rest satisfied. With them their speculations on Spiritual influence were teachings of holy writ. With us this was not true; but these speculations were eschewed as not teachings of holy writ. This gave great offense. We were at once arraigned before the world as denying all influence of the Spirit, which was not true. One thing we certainly denied, namely: that the holy Scriptures either taught or sanctioned the *speculations* of our opponents. But this was a distinction which the world in its grossness did not see. High prejudices were consequently excited against us. These prejudices shut the popular ear to our teachings. We could not overlook the fact. In order therefore that the truth in

its course might not be hindered through us, we were compelled to come forward and take part in these discussions against our original convictions and present inclinations. Such is our apology for the part we have taken, and are still taking in the controversy on Spiritual influence.

Further, the phrase Spiritual influence is not a Scriptural one. With us, therefore, it was, *prima facie*, something to be deeply suspected. We handled it shyly, fearing lest the Adversary in his subtlety had infused into it, since it had now grown so much in favor with all ears, some fatal drug. Nor even yet are we recovered from that fear. We wish the phrase was wholly disused; and perhaps even the expression of this wish may subject us to the charge of denying all Spiritual agency in conversion. Be it so; we are immovable. But in orthodox lips the phrase has a special significance. It there denotes not the true influence of conversion, but a hidden miraculous energy which, in conversion, is not present, but merely assumed to be. While, therefore, it was by many accepted as expressing the truth, it in reality expressed a falsehood, or at least what can never be shown to be the truth. On this ground, again, we objected to it; and that objection still lies against it.

The word of God contains no formal statement on converting influence. In expressing our convictions respecting it, therefore, we are under the necessity of constructing a proposition of our own. This we feel to be a most delicate task. To construct a proposition which, in a case like the present, shall, on the one side, be just to the teachings of the New Testament, and on the other, exclude all error, requires a degree of skill we tremble to lay claim to. Nevertheless we shall venture to submit the following:

As far as conversion is traceable to an influence not human, neither providential, it is traceable to the truth and to that alone.

This proposition, though containing more words than those in which our brethren usually express themselves, will still I think on close inspection be found to possess some peculiar advantages. That it is perfectly clear is obvious at a glance. On this score then it is unexceptionable. It assumes, as will readily be perceived, that conversion is an effect, the correctness of which will hardly be denied. Now the strict question arising on this is, to what immediate cause shall we ascribe that effect? The answer to this question will determine the truth or falsity of my proposition. The effect is given in conversion. But whether all its causes, actual and possible, can be discovered by us, the proposition does not assume to decide. If there be hidden causes known only to God, it takes no account of them. The existence of any such, however, is, of course, in strict logical propriety, to be

denied. That the effect, conversion, is traceable to some extent in the direction of its cause, the proposition takes for granted. But what it affirms is that it is traceable to the truth, and what it virtually denies is that it can be traced any further. This virtual denial is implied in the word *alone*. Just here two things must, I think, be conceded. First. That the means by which we are to trace conversion to its cause are two: 1. The certain light of revelation, and 2. The uncertain light of human reason. Second. That if after the thorough use of these two lights, we find that conversion is traceable to the truth, and that it cannot be traced to anything beyond it, then are we not only to set down the truth as *the* cause of conversion, but as the only cause. This done and my proposition is established.

Further, the proposition implies, let it be noticed, that human influence may also contribute to conversion; and this we know to be actually the case as in preaching, and in innumerable other ways. But although human agency is generally, indeed we may say universally in one way or another, made subservient to conversion, yet it is not in all cases, and under all circumstances, indispensable to it. For educate a man and give him the Bible, his conversion is then practicable though he should never afterwards see a human face or hear a human voice.

What is here said of human agency, the proposition also implies of those incidents of life which are popularly, and we think correctly, denominated providential. However, there is this difference, that the latter being more rare are the more dispensable, and are hence to be taken much less into the account as causes than the former.

But we are proceeding too fast. In what acceptation am I taking the word conversion? I reply, to express strictly an inner change or a change in the inner man; and hence not as embracing the whole process of turning to God. Whether this acceptation of the term is its most correct one, need not be made a question here. It is sufficiently so to warrant its use in this place.

The proposition, as will be seen, raises no question of power respecting the Spirit; no question as to what it can or cannot do. Indeed, no proposition constructed by my brethren ever, by implication or otherwise, raises this question. It is one which has been forced upon us by the folly of our opponents. When discussing conversion we have taken the ground that the power which effects it is limited to such influences only as are felt in the truth. For this reason we have been accused of limiting the Spirit's power. The accusation, however, has been wholly gratuitous. When I say God produces an ear of wheat by means of a grain of the same being placed in the earth under favorable

atmospheric and other circumstances, I by no means thereby limit his power. I merely state the law which governs the production of wheat, but start no question of power. Whether God can produce wheat in any other way, need not be made a question at all, since it is a fact that he never does produce it in any other way. So when I say that the power of the Spirit which effects conversion is an influence felt only in the truth, or that it is the truth itself acting on the soul, I certainly do not thereby affix any limit to the power of the Spirit. I merely state the uniform law in conformity to which it accomplishes a certain result. Since, however, it is never known to effect that result in any other way or through any other means, this is the same thing to us *practically* as if it could not. Still the two questions are widely different, the one being a question of power, the other being one of fact.

But just here I must turn aside long enough to notice what I conceive to be an exceedingly faulty form of speech occasionally in use by a few of my brethren. "We must not presume to limit the Spirit's power," say these brethren, "no, not even in conversion. For aught we know," they continue, "the Spirit may have a thousand channels of approach to the human soul, and a thousand means of operating on it besides the truth." Now, in candor I ask what all this means? Suppose the Spirit has a thousand channels of approach to the soul, of which we can know absolutely nothing, what then? Does it ever use them? We cannot say it does. Are they any advantage, then, to us? None surely of which we have even the slightest conception. To us, then, its having them is the same thing, so far as knowledge or faith or any peace of soul is concerned, as though it had them not. Suppose now we deny that it has them, where is either the evil to us or dishonor to it? I confess I cannot see. To deny the existence or reality of what is absolutely and wholly unknown, seems to me to be no very flagrant abuse either of reason or common sense. But why is the foregoing language used? It is not merely for the purpose of expressing a hypothesis which may possibly be true. No, very far from it. It is a covert and unmanly way of expressing a faith. When these brethren say the Spirit may have a thousand means of operating on the soul besides the truth, this is their faith and not a hypothesis. They both believe that it has these means and that it actually uses them. Why not, then, assert it—boldly and fearlessly assert it? The answer is obvious. To assert it would place them in the awkward and untenable position of asserting that to be true for which they have neither proof nor reason. From this position they shrink; hence they assert it not. I believe the Spirit has one way, one grand, all-sufficient way of reaching the soul and converting it, and I am without faith that it has any

other way. Thus far I feel safe in affirming, no farther. As to the position that the Spirit may have a thousand means, while I shall not deny it, I do not believe it. It is a sheer assumption which we have no means of verifying. Besides, it squints, it seems to me, towards an affinity, without the candor to avow it, with sectarianism in its unsoundest moods on Spiritual influence. I eschew the position and the language.

As to the Holy Spirit itself, we conceive it to be a *person*; and not a mere energy or influence. True, the Scriptures affirm nothing directly to this effect. They seem rather to take it for granted, or treat it as a matter understood; and certainly they abound with epithets which imply it. We are baptized in the name of the Spirit; it may be sinned against, lied to, tempted, and grieved; it is said to know the things of God, foresee the future, have a mind, speak, direct the apostles, select their words for them; in short, it is represented as possessing those attributes and doing those things which are peculiar to *persons* only, and this too not in figurative, but in plain literal language. But we do not propose to argue the matter at length. The view just expressed is the one generally acquiesced in, and hence need not be enlarged upon.

But here, perhaps, I shall be asked why, if the Holy Spirit is a person, do I so often designate it by the word *it*? I reply, that the reason is purely grammatical and not doctrinal. The word spirit is of the neuter gender in English, and so is its representative in Greek. This is the sole reason for the use of the word *it*.

Finally, before proceeding to the defense of my proposition, it may be noticed, that it omits all mention of the Spirit. Why this? the reader may possibly ask; and is there not something ominous in it? I can assure him there is not. In discussing conversion the question is from what *influence* does it result, not from whom does the influence proceed. It is universally conceded, I believe, that the influence, be it what it may, proceeds from the Spirit. Certainly this is the faith of my brethren. Since, therefore, there is no controversy as to the source of the influence, this need not be made a question. Hence my proposition omits it.

I am now done with preliminaries, and at once proceed to submit the arguments on which the truth of my proposition rests.

I. My first argument is based on the *connection between the enlightenment of the mind and conversion*. I set it down as a truth never to be questioned that where the knowledge of Christ is not, there conversion never can occur. For whether we restrict the meaning of the term to the inner or the outer man, conversion is strictly the *act* of turning to Christ. Now to say that any man can in any sense turn to him without some knowledge of him, is to

say what every one must instantly and intuitively see to be false. Again, that the mind cannot be enlightened respecting Christ without the truth, is as clear to thought, as it is that we cannot have a shadow without a substance to cast it. Conversion, then, depends to some extent, to say no more, on the enlightenment of the mind; and this enlightenment depends absolutely and wholly on the truth. Hence, to some extent, certainly, conversion is traceable to the truth; and to this extent my proposition is true. But let me be understood. I do not affirm that the mere illumination of the mind is conversion; nor that it necessarily leads to it; but that conversion implies a certain amount of it without which it is never effected.

II. My second argument is deduced directly from the word of inspiration. The passage is this: "The law of the Lord is perfect *converting the soul*." Such is the language of David, and on it we fear not to rest the whole controversy. Here we have the soul, the thing converted; next the word convert applied to it and expressing the change it undergoes; and last the law of the Lord solemnly declared to be *that which effects this change*. This is absolutely conclusive. The heart that can reject it is alike insensible to the force of reason and the authority of revelation.

III. I deduce a third argument from *the identity between being begotten by the gospel and conversion*. For if the two are not identical the distinction is obvious: that comprehends this; hence whatever produces that of course produces this. The following assertion of Paul to the Corinthians supplies me with this argument: "In Christ Jesus *I have begotten you through the gospel*." Did this begetting include their conversion? None can deny it. Then since that was effected through or by the gospel, clearly this was too. But the gospel and the truth are phrases identical in sense. Therefore conversion is traceable to the truth.

IV. My fourth argument is suggested by the fact that to believe with the heart, in the Scriptural sense of the phrase, and conversion, in the sense in which I am now using the word, are, if not equivalent, so nearly so, that the one is the immediate antecedent of the other. Of the correctness of this position I shall attempt no defense. It is deemed simply certain. To believe with the heart is to believe sincerely or truly. On what now does it depend? The answer is, on the truth. "Then cometh the Devil and taketh away the word out of their hearts *lest they should believe* and be saved."—Parable of the sower. The word, then, or the truth, left in the heart is the seed of faith, that on which it depends. Hence, since to this seed faith is traceable, to this seed also conversion is traceable. There is perhaps this distinction which should be taken notice of: that faith first takes possession

of the soul, then immediately out of it springs conversion, which is the voluntary act of the soul in turning to Christ. The distinction, however, is a little metaphysical, and is not insisted on.

V. My fifth argument is drawn from the fact that we are begotten to God as children by the truth. "*Of his own will begot he us with the word of truth.*" That this begetting includes conversion cannot be questioned. It is furthermore absolutely certain that it is effected by the truth. Hence by the truth conversion also is effected. This is simply demonstrative. The truth of my proposition I hence hold to be indisputable.

VI. My sixth and last argument is founded on the declaration of Peter that we are "*born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God.*" That to be born again, even construing the language as having reference to a change in the inner man, is either identical with conversion or includes it, is, I believe, universally conceded. This then is to be taken as a settled point. Now by what influence or power is this being born again effected? The answer is at hand in the apostle's own language, "*by the word of God.*" Consequently by the word of God is conversion effected, or to it is it traceable; and since this is what my proposition affirms, I again infer its truth.

In a numerical point of view these arguments might be greatly extended, but I extremely question whether their probative force would thereby be in the least increased. He who would not be convinced by these would not be convinced by a score though each succeeding one should increase in conclusiveness that many fold. It is not mere number in arguments which gives to them their determining power, but their soundness and pertinency. Possessed of these traits a single argument should be enough. On this ground ours need never have reached the number they have attained. On more than one of them singly would we be willing to risk the matter in issue. Together, we must in candor say we think them overwhelming. With this we submit them to the thoughtful disposal of the reader.

The evils of the theory we have just been opposing demand something more than the casual notice we can here bestow upon them. That theory sets out with the assumption that in conversion the Spirit spends on the soul of the sinner a hidden miraculous energy, by means of which a peculiar change is wrought therein, of which the convert is rendered, at the moment, vividly conscious. Many, very many of the human family have accepted the teachings of that theory as true. What has been the effect on them?

In the first place they set down to wait for the exertion of that mysterious energy, and to watch the tablets of the soul to see

when that change takes place. On they wait and watch. If accurate observers of the workings of the mind they detect no change for which they cannot account on ordinary grounds, and lying far this side of the regions of that strange energy. They still watch on. At last one by one they pass off. The last memorial words of each are these: "Oh, that I were a Christian then could I die content. But I know that I can do nothing of myself. I must await the Lord's time." A few hours more and the waiter is gone, gone in delusion, gone in despair. Or if these watchers be careless noters of what takes place in the inner man; if they be a little impatient, and withall possess a somewhat fruitful fancy, soon the mysterious power descends, and the wild shout, "I am through!" announces the glorious consummation. The church and the favored party go into high glee together: a day is set when the latter is sprinkled, and enrolled as a "church member," when the farce and the delusion are alike complete.

In the second place, those who accept the teachings of that theory have, as a consequence, their thoughts turned almost wholly away from the word of God. With them the Bible is an excellent book, venerable for its great age, and to be respected for its high authority; but then it can do them no good. The decrepit old thing is left, but with profound respect, to repose in state on the family stand, while its owner dreams away over the "Lord's time" yet to come. Such are two at least of the evil effects of the theory in question; and having stated these we shall now take leave of it for the present.

On the other hand, the position of my brethren brings the human soul and the human heart directly into contact with the Bible, whose words are "spirit and life." And after all, though men may speak of it as the "mere word," we cannot but feel that, like the wick of the candle, it is that around which the living flame of life ever burns. Or if they will still call it the "cold black letter," then is it life's dark lantern in which flickers the only lamp left to shed its ray along the "straight and narrow path." In this sheltered position, and in this alone is there safety. From the Bible must we strictly take our faith, and here go to learn our practice. May we as a people never turn from its hallowed pages, grow less in love with its teachings, feel less respect for its authority, or enjoy less vividly the hope it enkindles in the human breast.

MY CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Do not infer, kind reader, from the above caption that I really own a church. Such an inference would be a gross nonsequitur. I own no church; and in this am most unpardonably unlike "*the city pastors*." But you tell me some very good people believe in pastors owning churches. I collect this from a remark made by a gentleman in my presence just now. He stated that on last *sabbath* he attended divine service in *Mr. Tully's church*, on the corner of Ninth street, between Vine and Myrtle; that he heard there a very excellent sermon from this most amiable *divine*, that there was nothing doctrinal in it; and that all parties went away declaring they were *so* pleased. I believe, too, I have heard many speak of Mr. Elton's church on La Nice avenue, between 4th and 5th. They spoke, if I am right, particularly of the noble organ there, of its delicious tones, of the accomplished choir; and of the church as being a very desirable place to visit on account of the wealth and fashion that frequent it. I doubt not many very excellent folks really believe that Mr. Tully and Mr. Elton own these churches; and however much I may feel inclined to differ from people in some things, in this at least I am in no condition to offer a very robust dissent. I am much of the opinion that the gentlemen named really own the churches where they officiate. At least until I have some evidence that there is a *higher* claim to them, I shall not question their rights.

But, reader, understand me: although I own no church, yet I am most anxious to own one, i. e., a house; and as I have not the slightest hope of ever having one unless I build it, I have concluded at once to address myself to that task. My church shall be a fabric in the air; it hence will be cheap. True it is not exactly the thing I should like to call mine; but a sort of shadowy image of it, a dim outcasting of the mind's draft. Should you at any time, while my work is going forward, find yourself inclined to fault it, remember that you have not the slightest right to do so. The work is most strictly mine, is in no sense yours; and hence you have no right to demur. Besides there is much folly (a thing of which, of course, you can never be guilty) in objecting to things so unsubstantial as mere schemes of the brain; especially, before they are matured, and made to wear some visible, bodily form. Be silent, then, and question nothing respecting my airy work.

My determination is formed: my house shall be of bricks resting on a substantial basis of stone. The bricks shall be pressed bricks, soundly burnt, with all edges straight, and angles sharp. They shall lie in mortar thin and fine, with seams small, and lines without a fault. My walls shall be massive, severely plain, finished inside and out, in every whit to the line of the plummet. My roof shall stand at no odd angle, and shall be covered with slate in the best style. This will last, exclude all water, and will give to my house an air of deep gravity. My cornice shall be heavy and plain, jutting well over the walls; with not a seam, joint, nail head, or mark of a hammer to be seen. My roof shall be adorned with no horns, no battlements, no turrets, no pinacles, no lightning-daring steeples. No creaking, slamming window shutters in deep green shall disgrace the walls of my house. In front shall stand a single door, an ample, heavy, oaken door, varnished simply, and hence showing its native grain and color. Painted doors on meeting-houses are like hypocrites. They are nice things to look at; but I know not what is beneath.

All this being now done, my house shall be painted some fine neutral tint, giving to it an air of sobriety, purity, and durability. My house shall not be painted in blocks like stone, oh, how I detest such hypocrisy; nor yet in garish white, or scandalous red—not a bit of it. In a word, my house shall stand, in extern appearance, severely simple, and in proportions most just, the whole wearing a sober, modest air, with just a little tinge of melancholy playing like a magic spell over the entire fabric.

Such without shall be my house. To the worldly passer-by or flippant belle, this house will not be likely to present many inducements to enter. Such people, like things with wings, prefer to buzz round steeples, or nod where the luxurious notes of some great organ tempt to repose. But should a highly cultured and truly sober man pass this way, he will at once pause before my house, and, folding his arms as if in deep study, he will inspect it closely. Being through, he will be heard to say half inaudibly: "At first I was not struck with that house, but on closer inspection there is something marvelously beautiful there. I cannot resist the inclination to go in." But hold, gentle reader, we are not ready yet to enter my house.

There are those grounds to which I must next invite your attention. My house is to stand sixty-five feet back from the street, in the middle of a lot a hundred feet wide by two hundred long. This lot is to be inclosed by a fence of wood, heavy and simple, but exceedingly neat—the whole painted the same color of the house. My gate is to be sufficiently heavy but not too large, with all its hinges, screws, latches, locks, and springs perfect. Not a

pencil mark shall be seen on that gate, nor the scar of a ruffian's knife on all that fence. The ground of my lot is to be nearly level, and finely turfed in bluegrass. This shall be kept smoothly and closely cut; and not a straw, nor a particle of litter shall be allowed to lie on it. It is always to be kept so clean and neat that the conclusion cannot be resisted that this is the identical grass which grew in Paradise. Here and there in my lot is to grow a flowering shrub, kept neatly trimmed, and standing in the center of a little circle two feet in diameter, from which the turf is to be removed, and where nothing else is to be allowed to grow. Nothing can be more agreeable to the eye than this fresh little circle of earth, with its fringe of grass and modest shrub. But the chief ornament in my lot, in the way of flowers, is to be the rose—that sad sweet relic of Eden. The stems are to stand tucked up to a wooden frame, with leather straps and tacks in their ends, like virtuous country wives sometimes tuck them up to the cheek of their cabin doors. I have often seen them there, and wondered how sin could ever enter that honest abode guarded by such a sentinel.

As for shade trees for a church yard, reader, I have a fancy of my own, as you will see. I like the aristocratic oak—emblem of strength, the chaste ash, the mournful elm, and the plain rustic walnut. These are my choice, and with them my lot shall be adorned. I do not like the cottonwood; it looks to me like a flirt. As for the sycamore it is a *methodistic* tree, big, pretentious, seldom sound, frequently hollow, a tree for woodcocks and old owls; and then vulgar legends have it that spooks affect to brood on those naked, airy limbs. I do not like the tree.

From the street to the door of my church is to be a broad flagging of stone cut smooth on the upper face, and fitting each other closely. All along on each side of this flagging are to be large scrapers for the feet—a hint which I am persuaded will work like a charm; for not a foot-print is to be seen on all that clean grass. Such shall be my church yard.

I am now prepared, reader, to enter my church and acquaint you with the manner in which I am going to fit it up and furnish it. On opening the large front door we find ourselves, as you see, in the *first room* or *entrance*. I do not like vestibule; neighbor Smith stares at me when I use it, and calls it a “big word.” This room serves to shut out the confusion of the street from the main room of my church; and is to be well provided with racks for wet cloaks and umbrellas, and with mats and rugs for cleaning feet.

Passing now through another door we enter the church-room proper. The floor of this is first to be covered with heavy mat-

ting. Then over this is to lie a compact carpet of fine fabric, neat design, and grave fast color. By this means all noise of feet will be absorbed, and the room will wear a quiet air. A church-room, even when there is passing about in it, should be hushed and silent. Nothing is more disagreeable to a person in a thoughtful, meditative mood than the shuffling of feet, and the cracking of boot heels. None but vulgar people ever walk heavy or make a noise in church.

My seats are to be of oak and heavy, with the natural color of the wood preserved. The bottoms are to be broad and deep, the backs of the proper height and standing at the easiest angle; and both backs and bottoms are to be cushioned well. Plethoric wool-sacks I like the best. So that a stranger on setting down and gliding back into one of these deep soft seats, will draw his coat around him, look askance at his friend and say, *this is all right*. But now, reader, you are beginning to demur. I insist, however, on having my way. When I set down in a church and am bored with a bad speech, I feel it to be but a poor compensation that I am provided with a good seat; and if I am listening to a fine thing I hate to be fidgetting about on a hard board in quest of a soft place. I still insist on my seats. All along the outer backs of my seats neat leather pockets are to be tacked at proper intervals; and each pocket is to contain a Bible and a hymn book.

My house is to be provided with no spittoons, for I detest filthiness in the house of God. If furnished with anything, it shall be with a few *troughs*; for although swine take no hints, men do.

My pulpit is to be of substantial oak like my seats, of chaste design but plain, of ample size and moderate height. It is to be furnished with a plain Bible, and a plain hymn book. I do not like gilt and clasps on Bibles. Clasps especially I dislike. They are a species of hieroglyph the meaning of which is, *what I shut open not thou*. They originated with the Mother of harlots.

My windows are to be tall and not very wide; the sash hung with weights, and glass transparent. I love the pure, glorious light of heaven; and when I see it struggling through stained glass into a church, it reminds me of the pure gospel struggling through sectarianism into the hearts of the people. My glass shall not be stained. My windows are all to have neat folding shutters, but these are to be hung on the inside, and not outside, of the house. The wood of both windows and shutters is to be oak to correspond with the rest of my house.

The walls and ceiling of my church are to be finished hard, in purest plaster. This done, I then intend to employ some fine arttitt, Hogarth or Vandyke, to paint them. I shall point him to those

long, blank, expressionless intervals between window and window, and between base and ceiling. These, Sir, I shall say to him, I wish you to cover after the best fashion of your art. The persons and scenes with which I want these walls adorned I will furnish you myself from one of the books you see in these pockets. But my walls, let me fancy, are now done, exquisitely done, to the delight of every eye, and the more cultivated the eye the deeper the delight. These walls now teem with sublime sense; the Bible has furnished the thought, and genius has fixed it there. They are a study to the Christian, a study to the stranger; and in Sunday school I teach my children many a lesson from them. But you are murmuring again, reader, and counting the cost of this. Be still, I beseech you, till my work is done.

Not a stove is to stand in my house. Such huge iron fixtures, with their crooked, rust-eaten pipes angling through the house, are fit to be seen no where except in houses of hard-shell Baptists, or predestinated Presbyterians. My house is to be heated by a furnace from beneath. It is to be splendidly lighted up, the whole looking like an enchanted place.

A very amiable Episcopalian lady has just suggested that nothing would add so much to the style of my house as a fine organ. She declares that it is known to her experimentally, that is to say, she has been so assured by the *mediums*, that God is delighted most of all with that music which is thumped out of melodeons or ground out of organs. I agreed with her at once, but on thoughtlessly suggesting that a conch would greatly add to the bass, she fainted, otherwise I really believe the result would have been an organ for my house.

Dr. Tidymus has also just called on me to insist that my house will be utterly incomplete without a baptistery. I agreed with the Doctor, and added that, besides, I could make a baptistery a source of revenue to the church by using it as a pond in which to breed fishes for Jews, and frogs for Frenchmen. This he took in high dudgeon and left muttering something about ill-breeding or the like.

Give me the fluent stream, the deep, clear pool embowered in trees when I have to immerse. I love a secluded spot away from the buzz of the city, the dust of the street, and the vulgar gaze of profane crowds. There let me meet a few choice spirits—brethren and sisters in Christ, where all is solemnity, and where all can sing and weep, and enjoy the scene to our heart's content. But here for the present I must pause.

CHAPTER II.

WELL, reader, I have at last completed my house; and now that it is done, how sensibly do I feel that it is all of the earth earthly. Having now finished it, I am a little at a loss to know how best to dispose of it. Upon the whole I have decided to make a present of it to a congregation of Christians who live in the city where I have built it, but who as yet have no house of worship to meet in. These Christians are a peculiar people, being zealous of good works; they refuse to be known by any other names than those worn by the primitive Christians; and, strange as it may appear to you, they have no creed but the Bible. They seem to me a right worthy people, and I shall make them a present of my house.

Having now enjoyed, gentle reader, an opportunity of meeting for several successive weeks with the congregation to whom I presented my church, and having by inquiry, and personal intercourse made myself pretty well acquainted with them, I propose to give you some account of this rather remarkable, if not singular, people.

The congregation numbers in all fifty. Their personal appearance on entering the church at first struck me as a little odd. They all dress most noticeably plain. I do not mean that either the men or women have any uniform fashion after which they cut; nor that all of either sex dress in the same kind of goods. I mean strictly that they dress very plain. The material in which the men dress, although remarkably neat, and faultlessly clean, I take to be quite cheap. I should think none of it cost over a dollar a yard. Their clothes are made in the very best style, and worn with exquisite taste. The men remind me of certain specimens of ancient statuary. There is not a garment with which you can dispense with propriety, and yet there is precisely enough. The whole sits so becomingly and easily on the person that although you cannot exactly say it is fine, yet for your life you cannot make an alteration without impairing the symmetry of the whole. All that is here said, and I make the remark in high praise, is equally true of the women. One thing among the females struck me with peculiar force—not one has her ears pierced, and they wear no jewelry. I have not seen a single ear-pendant, wristlet, or ring, nor among the men so much as a breast-pin or watch-seal. I learn that they have these things at home, and wear them on ordinary occasions, but never in the house of God. In that holy place, they say, all should appear in a style remarkably plain, neat, and pure. I think I have never seen a worship-

ing assembly exhibit, in its outward appearance, so little of earth as this. Being curious to have a reason for it, as I took for granted they had one, I one day approached one of the overseers of the congregation and asked him why his brethren dressed thus. He blushed and modestly replied: "Friend, your question is legitimate, but it elicits from me a rather painful answer. There are many poor in our community, who cannot afford to dress better than you see us dressed. They would feel pained by a difference in dress which should constantly remind them of this circumstance. Some of these are here to-day, and are members of our body, but you cannot distinguish them. These brethren are very dear to us, and we are unwilling to hurt their feelings by dressing better than you see us dressed. Besides, we think it right in us to appear thus in the presence of God. We hence have a double pleasure in it." I turned away from this good man saying in my heart, these are Christians indeed, and hence know how to "condescend to men of low estate."

When assembled in their house I noticed that the males and females do not sit together. The fathers take the little boys, the mothers the little girls. I greatly admired this plan, and think the only reason that can be assigned for a promiscuous sitting is one either of sensuality or pride. The house of God is not the place for men and women to sit touching each other. There is another thing I deem worthy of remark in the sittings of this congregation. The members never change their seats. Hence, when a member is absent his seat is vacant. I learn that the congregation make this commendable use of this arrangement. Whenever a seat is vacant it is at once inferred that something is wrong, either that sickness or misfortune has overtaken the missing member. Inquiry is immediately made, and if anything has happened calling for aid it is promptly extended. An incident occurred a few meetings ago illustrating the advantages of this excellent plan, which I think it worth while to relate.

The seat of a poor but most faithful brother was vacant. His little daughter, however, was present, and was occasionally seen to weep. An aged sister approached her and asked the cause. The artless child replied: "Last night our house was burned and everything in it; and when I left home poor Ma was weeping, and oh, it hurts me so much." This aged sister walked forward to the preacher and made the accident known. He at once arose and announced it to the congregation, simply adding, "help, brethren, look not every man on his own things but also on the things of others." The whole congregation simultaneously arose and rushed to the stand in front of the pulpit. Two thousand dollars were raised on the spot, and I declare I believe if ten had been

needed it would have been raised. I never saw anything like it. Each member seemed to fear that a chance would not be afforded him of doing what he wished. The next morning the whole congregation was on the spot of that ruined home. A new house arose, as if by enchantment, out of those ashes. That furniture, those beds, that clothing, all came back as if by magic. By the next Lord's day the only remaining trace of that burnt house was that a better one stood in its stead, the shade trees in the yard were a little scorched, and the ashes of the old home had been strowed along the walk from the door to the front gate.

The manner in which this incident was spoken of in the community gave great offense to members of other churches in town. Men of the world declared outright that this was the only truly Christian church in the place, that they would not give a pinch of snuff for all the other cold, niggardly things in town, and that if they ever joined any congregation at all, it would be the one meeting at Bethel, for this is now the name by which my house is known.

Again, I think I notice something very peculiar in the *greetings* of these people on coming into their house. They grasp each other in the hand so quick and strong, and give each other a look so cordial, sweet, and kind, that I declare it is worth while attending their church merely to see them meet. Nor can I detect in their intercourse even the slightest approach to vulgar familiarity. They evidently know how to be courteous, and not only so, they certainly love each other most tenderly. The warm virtuous look of the eye, the amiable unsinister smile, together with a mannerism indescribably witching, most clearly evince this. I am in the habit of attending church at several other places besides this, but no where else do I see anything even approaching what I witness here. These meetings affect me much. My feelings are often deeply moved, and for the life of me I cannot tell why. Every body seems delighted to attend the place. The very atmosphere you breath seems quick with divine life. The attraction to be here is irresistible, and then you linger on the spot as if held in some strange spell.

In their order of worship several things strike me as noteworthy. In their singing, which I pronounce excellent, I discover they prefer the older type of tunes. "Old Hundred," for instance, seems a favorite with them, and in almost all their Lord's day meetings I notice they sing

"Safely through another week."

They seem, too, to be much attached to that fine old piece,

"O, thou Fount of every blessing."

In all this I must confess, I think their taste excellent. Those grand old airs are the very melody of the soul, and those match-

less hymns the very utterances of the pious heart. They all sing sitting.

But when the Holy Scriptures are to be read they all arise, and stand listening in profoundest reverence. While the reading is proceeding each member holds in front an open Bible, looking on. This done, they all resume their seats. They stand, they tell me, as a token of respect for the holy word of God, I could wish the custom universal provided it prevailed through real respect for the Bible and not as a mere form.

Their prayers, in some respects, are remarkable. Every member in the church takes part in them when called upon. They are very free from all conventional forms, and studied phrases. They seem to be more a simple confiding talk with God than anything else. Yet to me there is something grand in those simple measured petitions. They often become deeply affecting. While listening to one the other day I felt as if my heart would break. Determining, if possible, to discover in what this secret power lay, I resolved to jot down one of these prayers and study it. I here transcribe it:

"All-merciful Father, thy little flock, still helpless and poor, are in thy presence again. In the name of our blessed Mediator we come, and since unworthy, in deep humility. Turn not thy face away from us when we cry to thee. Hear us in thy clemency; and when thou hearest forgive. We have all been kept through another week, have had our bread and clothing from thee. Accept our humble thanks for these thy favors. Teach us to be always grateful, and help us in all our ways to acknowledge thee. Keep us in safety through another week. Suffer us not to be tempted. Save our eyes from tears and our feet from wandering. Remember, Lord, especially remember our brother Lamb who lies so sick to-day. His life is in thy hand; may it be thy will to spare him. Pity his anxious wife, pity his helpless little ones; and restore to us our brother again. O! hear us in his behalf. But in all things thy will be done. Amen."

When I arose I had a secret impression in my heart that God would hear that prayer and spare that man. How this may turn out I cannot tell, but such impressions do me good, and I like to have them. Now in the foregoing prayer there is certainly nothing great or very striking. Indeed, to many it is difficult to see in what its power lies. Ah! reader, its power lies in this, that it was uttered from a pure heart that felt every syllable of it. This is its secret.

Now how striking the contrast between the simple scene I have just been describing, and what I witnessed at Trinity church last week. The Rev. Dr. Specks gave out the week previous

that he would deliver a discourse on "*The essence of the Logos as psychologically conceived in ἀρχή*." The flock ventured to predict that the discourse would never be excelled. I was curious to hear it, and so attended. Although service was announced for 10-30, the Rev. Dr. did not enter until 10-35. He entered wearing a long black gown and carrying a very small gold-headed cane. One hand was covered with jetty kidd, the other was naked and fair as a maid's hand. His step was courtly, his look heavenly. He walked forward to the first step of the pulpit; and there dropped on his knees, but said not a word. I shuddered, and was seized with a vulgar fear that he was a "consulter of familiar spirits," "a practitioner of arts inhibited and out of warrant." I was just in the act of leaving in great trepidation, fearing that I might be spelled, when one of his flock, observing my alarm, whispered: "he is wrestling with God in prayer." This gave me instant relief; I at once became composed, and heard the discourse to its end. It was thirty-two minutes and nine seconds long. During the last part of the discourse the Rev. Dr. became much excited; so much so, that he unconsciously stepped out of the pulpit, and walked half way down the aisle exhorting all the time. Suddenly he fell on his knees saying: "let us silently pray." I kneeled, but just as my soul was becoming absorbed in communion with God, "Amen," screamed the Dr.: I was startled, and though not half through, informally closed. I now retired, but as I was leaving heard a very grave looking man muttering something about "insulting heaven," and "enacting farces in the name of religion," but I did not stay to collect particulars.

The preaching at Bethel is eminently didactic, that is to say, it is designed to *teach* the people the holy Scriptures. Hence, it generally consists of a very clear, simple exposition of some chapter, paragraph, or verse. On leaving the church you seldom hear the common question: "How did you like the sermon?" On the contrary, the remark you generally hear is, "I never understood that passage so well before." Indeed, it is a common saying that if you want to hear something nice, go either to Trinity, or Grace Chapel, but if you want to hear the truth, go to Bethel. The discourse being over a hymn is sung, which closes this part of the services of the day.

The next thing in order is the supper. A table is now prepared extending entirely across the house, and covered with a clean white linen. On one end of this, near the preacher, stands the loaf and cup, the latter being in all cases the pure juice of the grape. A simple thanks is offered for the loaf when it is distributed, all partaking of it standing. Next the wine is disposed of in the same way.

I was curious to have a reason for this part of their practice, remonstrating at the same time against their attitude, and their long unwieldy table. They told me that as no position was prescribed in the New Testament, they regarded the matter as left entirely to their own choice; that they preferred standing merely because they thought it the most reverential attitude. They added, however, that as neither this, nor their table, was a question settled by the Bible, it was no matter of conscience with them, that if a better course were pointed out they were quite ready to adopt it; or if any member's feelings should be hurt with either, they should certainly abandon it. This indicated a spirit so tractable and so nonproscriptive as to command my cordial praise, and to make me regret that I had even named their standing or their table. Thus should all questions unsettled by the Bible, be viewed and treated by Christians.

In the evening the congregation again meets, but their time is now spent in reviewing the chapter commented on in the forenoon. Their intercourse is very free, all taking part in it. They evince a wonderful skill in eliciting the meaning of a passage. I was really surprised at the depth of their penetration, their powers of analysis, and their seeming intuitive perception of divine truth. I attributed it all, however, to the fact that their minds are kept in constant contact with the word of God, which must in all cases, give precision as well as reach to thought.

The public services of the church now usually close; and the members return home to spend the rest of the day in reading, meditation, and prayer. I was remarkably struck with one peculiarity in their private dwellings; *every house had a closet for prayer*. I have never seen anything of the kind elsewhere. I am told that every member of the family, at some hour of the day, repairs to this closet for secret prayer. Here fathers take their little sons, and, making them kneel in their presence, put their hands on their little heads, and implore the blessings of God upon them. The mothers especially are said to do this. And certainly I never saw so pious and so well-behaved a set of children as these Christians have. They are never seen gadding about the streets on Sunday, or strolling up and down creeks fishing. The children seem so intelligent and kind, that their parents are never so happy as when at home in their society. I wish it was so everywhere.

These Christians evince the greatest solicitude for the salvation of their neighbors, often urging upon them privately, in meetings sought for that very purpose, the necessity of becoming obedient to Christ; but if possible, still greater solicitude for the safety of those who have united with them. A few weeks since a man uni-

ted with the congregation, who was notoriously covetous. The day after he was baptized the Elders visited him, when the following occurred: "We visit you to-day, dear brother, for the purpose of a confidential talk. You are now one of us, dear to us as our own flesh, and we greatly long after the prosperity of your soul. The sin we come to warn you against is covetousness. You have the reputation in this community of being a very covetous man; and we have reason to think you not wholly undeserving the charge. Remember, if you persist in this sin it will ruin your soul. Remember, further, that our congregation has not joined you, but that you have joined it. It hence has claims not only upon you but upon all you have. We shall expect from you many a proof in the way of liberality that you are deeply penitent for the past, and that you are now wholly consecrated to Christ." All this was said in the most affectionate spirit, and with deep emotion. The only reply the man made was, "brethren kneel and pray for me." They all kneeled and prayed and wept together. On arising the man added—"brethren, you are true men. Nothing but a sense of duty could have prompted this. I thank you for it. But in time past I have sinned and greatly perverted myself. I am young in the cause, and my past life may sometimes have the effect to obscure my judgment and prevent my doing right. Will you counsel me, brethren, and tell me what I ought to do, and with the Lord's help I will do it." They said "we will," and grasped his hand and fell on his neck and wept. That man seems effectually cured; he even thinks the church most mild in its demands upon his liberality.

Thus is every member dealt with that enters their congregation. Right off they attack his sins, be they what they may, and never desist till they have either cured him or put him away. They will not endure them that are evil. The reputation, consequently, of the congregation in the community where it meets is most salutary. Its power for good is truly wonderful. It seems destined to effect a complete revolution in its vicinity. True, the other churches of the place affect to treat it with great scorn, pronouncing it not orthodox and the like; but nevertheless it is very evident that it controls, notwithstanding, the best minds and the best hearts in the town. How it should exert such an influence is a complete enigma to partisans, but to no one else. Its power is easily accounted for.

Never have I known a church evince so much regard for a preacher; and never have I known a preacher so much attached to a church. The relation between them seems indissoluble. They love their preacher because he is a good man; and he loves them because they are a pious people. True, he is not a

man of great talents, but they say he understands the Book and can teach that, and that the greatest genius could do no more. Several very brilliant preachers have visited them at different times, and greatly charmed them with the splendors of their eloquence; but they have uniformly refused to abandon their old and faithful servant. He tells me they are the most considerate people he has ever known; that he has been living with them ten years, and never once during that time has had to name to them his wants; that they anticipate him and pay, as a general rule, even more than they agreed to pay. He says it is a matter of wonder that they should raise his salary so quietly and pay it over so promptly, and withal so delicately. He declares that the manner of his brethern in these matters is more grateful to his feelings than all they do besides.

The congregation suffers no one of its members to be in debt. Not for a moment will they allow the apostle's injunction, "owe no man any thing," to be disregarded. They will put away a member just as quickly for breaking this precept as for adultery. They say they know no distinction among the commands of God; that they are all alike important with them, and that if a thing be enjoined in the word of God, that is enough for them; that they then resolutely require all their members to comply with it. They consider the disregard of the foregoing precept by sister churches to be productive of incalculable mischief. It is much to be regretted that their example is not universally followed.

If a member of the congregation happens to visit a ball or dance, he or she is not even so much as called upon for an apology. The church takes for granted, *and this is well known to all the members*, that its yoke has become burdensome, and quietly proceeds to remove it. Such is the promptness of the church to act in this and all like cases, and such the majesty of its calm, affectionate manner, that every act of the kind named is effectually prevented. They have had only two cases to occur in ten years; and these by the course just named were completely cured and reclaimed. The parties never ventured on a second offence.

Again, in their intercourse one with another and with the world, there is another rule from which they resolutely refuse to swerve. *In all things they do to others as they would that others should do to them.* They tell me they never suffer themselves even for a moment to disregard it. They train themselves to it, and strengthen themselves for it, and hence find it most easy in practice. They say that the pleasure arising from scrupulously living up to this rule is one of the most distinct and peculiar belonging to the Christian's life. They seem to be at an utter loss to under-

stand how professors can ever so far forget their best interests and their truest happiness, as to neglect the rule. In the correctness of this judgment, I must confess I feel myself obliged to concur.

But, reader, though I delight to linger over the lineaments of this church, yet must I bring this piece to a close. How long, O! how long, before the religious world will become in spirit and in deed what the Master intended it to be?

POPULAR LECTURES AND ADDRESSES BY A. CAMPBELL.—Such is the title of a work we have just received from the publishers. The paper of this work we think hardly as good as it should have been. The type is large and fine; and the mechanical execution of the work good. In appearance the work is very respectable, and contains 647 pages. It contains the finest likeness of Mr. Campbell we have yet seen. No one can look on that noble forehead without a feeling of deep regret that the strong brain of its owner is ever to cease its labors on earth. That man does not now live to whom the world is as deeply indebted as it is to Alexander Campbell. This is said in no mean spirit of flattery, but in the profound conviction that it is but a just tribute of respect to the name of a great and good and true man. We are glad to know that his Lectures and Addresses are now before the public in the handsome and available form in which they appear in the volume before us.

Of these Lectures or their merits we shall not here speak. With them most of our readers are acquainted; and they will desire to own them, not because they are not acquainted with them, but because they are. We wish the book a wide success. It contains, though not the most useful, yet the most brilliant and labored portions of Mr. Campbell's writings. These Lectures teem with thought and are replete with the large views of one of the most subtle thinkers of the age. No one can read them without feeling wealthier in thought, by far, for his labor. To the student of the Bible they are not without interest; for they touch, with the hands of a master, some of its deep themes. Let all, then, who wish to possess some worthy token of its honored author, or who may desire to look once more on the grand face which adorns it, before that face passes into the unseen, send for and get the book. Price of the work from \$2 50 to \$5.

Address, **JAMES CHALLEN & SON**, Philadelphia.

DO THE HOLY SCRIPTURES AUTHORIZE THE BAPTISM OF INFANTS?

THIS is certainly a most serious question—serious on many accounts. If the affirmative answer to the question be true, it cannot be denied that great sin is committed in opposing the doctrine. If the negative be true, great sin is committed in defending it. Does it not, then, become us, in candor, and in fairness, to give the question a very thorough examination. Such examination is proposed in the present essay, as far as the ability can be commanded to conduct it. In attempting to execute this task the following plan will be pursued :

1. I shall lay down the several only methods according to which any doctrine or practice can be shown to be taught in the Bible.

2. I shall then examine the chief arguments relied on to establish the doctrine of infant baptism.

But on this point let me be a little more explicit. I do not propose to examine *all* arguments relied on, nor even perhaps the oldest of them, but such only as seem to be the chief support of the doctrine at this day. The grounds on which the doctrine rests are not stable, but constantly shifting. Arguments confidently relied on a hundred years ago are now looked upon as obsolete. Many now regarded as irrefutable will, before half a century more is gone, be laid aside as wholly inconclusive and useless. Still there are those upon which, for the present at least, the doctrine is held to rest. To these, mainly, the present examination will look.

3. It is proposed to examine these arguments on strictly logical grounds; and to bestow on them no attention except such as, on these grounds, they are entitled to. By neglecting to attend to the latter part of what is here said, I believe that mischief has often been done. For example: the attempt is frequently made to refute by a formal effort what is merely an assumption, and hence, no argument at all. Such attempts often fail; and then the inference is drawn that what is not thus refuted is true. Now, in all such cases, the proper course is simply to deny the assumption, and this denial stands good against it, until an effort is made by affirmative arguments to sustain it. Then the issue shifts from the assumption to the arguments—the question being are they conclusive or not. If they are not conclusive the assumption must be held for the present as false.

But now to the first section of my task, which distributes itself into two parts—the first part relating to doctrine, the second to practice.

1. In how many methods can a doctrine be shown to be taught in the Bible? I answer, two and only two. I need hardly stop to tell even the common reader that the term doctrine means *what is taught*. It comes from the Latin *docere*, which means to teach. What is, or the thing, thus taught is doctrine. A doctrine, then, is taught, first, *by being actually asserted*. In a sentence, for instance, the thing said, affirmed, or predicated, is the doctrine. This is the first, and by far the most common method of teaching a doctrine; indeed, it may be said to be almost the universal method. A doctrine is taught, second, *by being necessarily implied*. In asserting one thing directly we often imply another. What is thus implied, that is, certainly implied, is a doctrine. It is not enough that we can say of a doctrine, it *may be* implied; for nothing is taught in this way. When all we can say of a thing is that it *may be* implied, this is a concession that it may not be implied. Of course nothing is made certain in this way. Indeed, it may be laid down as a universal rule, *that by mere possible implication nothing is taught*. Were this rule strictly applied, in all cases where applicable, it would correct nine tenths of the errors in Christendom. Nothing is more common, when a passage of Scripture is under consideration, than to hear it said of it, it may mean this or it may mean that, which of course implies that it may mean neither. Whatever, then, is not taught in the Bible either by being actually asserted, or necessarily implied, is no doctrine of Christ at least. A doctrine of men it may be, but a part of Christianity it certainly is not.

2. In how many methods can a practice be shown to be authorized in the Bible? The reply is—two and only two methods. The word practice is here taken to include whatever is done as matter of duty. First, then, a practice is authorized *by being actually commanded*. And this is to be construed as including things inhibited as well as things enjoined. Second, a practice is authorized when an instance of it having the divine sanction is adduced. This is commonly called teaching by approved precedent. In one or the other of these two methods must every practice be shown to be authorized, and whatever is not thus authorized is no part of Christianity. Clearly what is not commanded, neither has, in precedent, the divine sanction, is not a duty. This is so obviously true that nothing farther need be said in its defense. In some one of these four methods, therefore, if at all, must infant baptism be taught; but if taught in none of these, then it is an invention of men, and a libel upon the word of God.

Now, clearly, it is nowhere, as a doctrine, actually asserted in the Bible. No one even of its warmest advocates pretends to claim this for it. Neither is it anywhere, as a duty or a practice, actually commanded. Were such the case all dispute, at least as to its being a Bible institution, must at once cease. Nor is there any instance of it on record. Surely it must rest on precarious ground. Still there is one hope and but one for the doctrine—it *may be necessarily implied*. If it be not defensible on this ground, then is it defensible on none. And although it has never, that I know of, been formally acknowledged that this is the sole ground on which it can rest, yet that such is the case is clear from this, that none other remains. It is much to be regretted that this fact has not been steadily kept in mind both in defending and opposing the doctrine. Had it been kept in mind in defending it, it would have saved the advocates of the doctrine from much confusion of thought, and a most licentious use of Scripture; and kept in mind by its opponents it would have given point and success to their refutations. Much that has been said in defense would have appeared wholly irrelevant, and much that has been said in opposition wholly useless. Be it then constantly remembered that infant baptism, if authorized at all, rests on the ground of *necessary implication*, and on that alone. Still let no one think because I say on that alone, that any other is necessary; *provided*, the doctrine is *really shown* to rest on this. A single ground is enough.

I am now prepared for the examination of arguments, and in examining these I shall select those first which seem to be most general, or rather preliminary, in their character, and then such as seem intended more immediately for proof.

I. Infants are to be baptized because they are a part of redeemed humanity.

In a recent debate, this argument was urged with special emphasis by one of the first Methodist Elders in the west. From him it may pass into current use among his brethren. I therefore notice it. Stated at full length the argument is this: All redeemed humanity is to be baptized—infants are a part of redeemed humanity—therefore, they are to be baptized. Simply as an argument this is faultless. If we grant its premises we cannot deny its conclusion. But are its premises true? The minor is certainly true unless I misapprehend its meaning. The import of the epithet redeemed, however, is not clear. But the major is utterly and shamefully false. This premise was never conceived by a mind accustomed to accurate thinking. All redeemed humanity is not to be baptized. The atheist and the idolater belong to redeemed humanity in precisely the same sense in which

infants belong to it. Are they to be baptized? No one acquainted with the Bible believes it. The argument consequently proves too much, and is hence false. The following is exactly similar: All redeemed humanity is to be baptized—the atheist is a part of redeemed humanity—hence, he is to be baptized. This is glaringly false. But suppose it is denied that the atheist is a part of redeemed humanity, what then? Simply that we have two kinds of humanity—the one redeemed the other not. But here again we encounter a difficulty. This atheist belonged to redeemed humanity when an infant—he does not now. Has he changed his humanity? Nothing more need be said, unless it is that the word redeemed adds nothing to the argument, but merely serves to confuso.

II. The church of God has existed ever since the days of Abraham to the present. Infants were in the church in those days. Therefore, they should be in it now.

Few arguments have struggled harder to maintain their existence than this, and none ever deserved annihilation more. When any considerable portion of the human family can be duped into the reception, not belief, of a doctrine by such fallacies, I confess my hopes are low that the world will ever in large part, and rationally, receive Christianity. Unthinkingly and by accident it may receive it, but thoughtfully and in reason never. The argument is marked by two striking defects. First: The major premise is not true. It is a naked assumption, without even the semblance of support in the Bible. Is it anywhere either asserted or implied in the Bible, that the church of God was in existence in the days of Abraham? The whole thing is a cunning fable invented to subserve a bastard cause. The phrase, the church, has a well defined meaning in the New Testament—it denotes the body of Christ, the kingdom of heaven. The component members of this body, the citizens of this kingdom, are men and women born anew—born of water and the Spirit. No human being is a member of that body unless thus quickened—a citizen of that kingdom unless thus born. Such is the meaning of the phrase, the church, as used in the New Testament, and such its constituent materials. Now in this sense is it ever applied to anything in the days of Abraham? The man who can so affirm with the means of information at hand is beyond the reach of reason. Second: But even granting both premises of the argument to be correct, and the conclusion is merely probable. It is by no means certain that infants should be in the church now, because they were in it in the days of Abraham. The conclusion assumes, not only that the conditions of entering the church have never been changed, but that the same persons

who entered then may enter now ; but this, even on the hypothesis of a church in the days of Abraham, is not true. Indeed, it is not even claimed by the advocates of the doctrine that the conditions of entrance are the same. The conclusion consequently amounts to nothing. This defect is fatal to the argument as a basis for infant baptism ; for as a practice claiming to be of heaven, it cannot rest on a merely probable basis.

The only way in which the preceding argument can be made to wear even the appearance of plausibility is, to construct a purely arbitrary definition of the word church—such a one as may be applied to a state of things existing in the days and in the family of Abraham ; and then set up for it that it is the true definition of the church of Christ. And this has actually been done. The following is the definition of the term church by one of the most subtle, persistent, and unprincipled enemies of the true gospel of Christ : “The church is a body of people separated from the world for the service of God, with ordinances of divine appointment, and a door of entrance, or a rite by which members shall be recognized.” Such is the definition—now for its application. The family of Abraham was a body of people separated from the world for the service of God, with ordinances of divine appointment, and a door of entrance, or a rite by which members shall be recognized. As a loose, flimsy description of the family of Abraham, this might be accepted. But is this the definition of the church of Christ ? This is the fatal question. That family as thus defined, and the church of Christ are not identical things, hence, the definition of the one is not the definition of the other. First : The family of Abraham was a body of people—granted ; and the church of Christ is a body of people ; but is that body and this body one and the same body ? Of this proof is impossible. Second : That body was separated from the world, and so is the body of Christ. But was that body separated in the sense in which the body of Christ is separated ? That body was separated from the world, i. e., from the nations, but still was *of* the world in the strictest sense of the phrase—it was fleshly, not born again. The body of Christ is not only separated from the world, but *it is not of the world*—it is a new creation. Third : That body had ordinances of divine appointment ; and so has the body of Christ. But were the ordinances of that body identical with the ordinances of this ? Alas, for the blindness that can so think ! Fourth : That body had a door of entrance, or a rite by which members were to be recognized ; and so in a loose sense has the church of Christ. But what of it ? That body had one rite, this body has a different rite, are they therefore the same ? Such

are some of the follies and inconsistencies which mark the ground on which infant baptism is defended.

III. Baptism has come in the room of circumcision—infants were circumcised—therefore, they should be baptized.

A more humiliating proof of the extent to which human reason has been wrecked, and man rendered the dupe of error, could hardly be adduced than is to be found in the fact, that this argument should ever have found a human being to propound and defend it, or a human being to believe it. Yet by many, and for no short period, it has been relied on as confidently as though it were an oracle from heaven. On the score of merit as an argument it is entitled to no notice whatever. The sole reason for its appearance here is its popularity with those who practice infant baptism.

Baptism has come in the room of circumcision. Is this true? and, if so, how can we know the fact? Has baptism come in the room of anything? A more groundless assumption cannot be imagined. As truly and with as much show of sense could it be said that baptism came in the room of Aaron's calf. Baptism has come in the room of nothing. Such an element is not in the Scriptural conception of baptism. Hence, it cannot have come in the room of circumcision.

Infants were circumcised. Some were, but not all. Now from the fact that *some* infants were circumcised, even allowing that baptism has come in the room of circumcision, it could not be inferred that *all* infants are to be baptized. This fact would have to be clearly shown—it could not be assumed. In the present argument, therefore, we have two defects, to-wit: In the major premise, a falsehood, and in the conclusion, an illicit process of the minor term. These defects with many, I regret to know, amount to nothing. For strange as it may appear, it is nevertheless true, that while in anything else a single defect is enough to crush any argument, yet in religion it is not so. Here the more palpable the defect is, the greater is the tenacity with which the argument is held. Error in one sense resembles a mother's love. The more her babe is exposed to danger, the closer is it pressed to the maternal heart; and the more the instruments of error are exposed to refutation, the more determined is the feeling which they inspire not to abandon them. Still I have some feeble hope that the day may come when, with those who have the will and the power to think, such arguments as the preceding shall sink to the base level where they belong.

IV. All who have a right to membership in the church have a right to baptism. Infants have a right to membership in the church—hence, they have a right to baptism.

Few arguments serve the purpose of the sophist better than this. It contains the convenient term *right*, which affords him a fine field for declamation, and enables him to appear to the ignorant to be making a most robust defense when in reality he is merely spending his time in idle and pointless talk. Then, again, it is by no means clear what the expression, *right to membership in the church*, means; and people love to flatter their vanity by persuading themselves that they see a deep sense, and a conclusive argument in what they really know nothing about. Especially, if a little finess be displayed in propounding questions, the argument becomes overwhelming. Dare any man, let it be asked, allow that infants have a right to a place in heaven, but none to a place in the church? Will Christ receive them to his arms above in case of death, and yet exclude them from his flock on earth? Preposterous! Were Whately's head now to appear in a crowd of pedobaptist women who had just heard all this, nothing short of trepanning in half a score of places could save it. Of course to the logician this would all be mere twaddle. With him the first question would be, is it true that a right to membership in the church implies a right to baptism, or that a right to this follows from a right to that? Suppose he were to deny it, what then? Since proof of the assertion is impossible, it would of course stand for nothing. He might even go further, and insist that it is not true that a right to baptism follows from a right to church membership, but that the reverse is true, namely: That a right to church membership follows from a right to baptism. Were he disposed to be strictly correct he might go still further, and, after excluding the word *right*, say that he who is baptized is a member of the church, and that no one else either is or can be. But suppose he were even to grant that the major premise is correct, that is, that all who have a right to church membership have a right to baptism, and perhaps this would be the shortest way to end the controversy, still nothing would be gained. He would still deny that infants have this right. This would bring the minor in question; and here precisely is where the contest lies. *It is not true that infants have a right to church membership.* This being denied, nothing short of holy writ can make it good; and as it can never be made good by holy writ, the argument is therefore unsound and its conclusion false.

I am now prepared to examine those arguments which are especially held as sustaining the doctrine in question. As these claim to rest immediately on the word of God, they are, on that account, the better entitled to notice. In examining them, I shall first cite the passage of Scripture on which each is based; I shall then present in due form the argument based on it; and in the

last place I shall test the soundness of this argument, as the preceding arguments have been tested. First, then, I cite the following:

"Then were brought to him little children, that he should put his hands on them and pray; and the disciples rebuked them. But Jesus said suffer little children, and forbid them not to come to me; for of such is the kingdom of heaven. And he laid his hands on them and departed." Matt. xix: 13-15.

To the pedobaptist this possesses peculiar advantages. It affords him two arguments, and a parallel case to his own practice; and what more can he ask than this? First, as to the parallel case. The pedobaptist's proposition, to-wit: the holy Scriptures authorize the baptism of infants, contains the term infants. The passage in hand contains the phrase little children. The boldest opponent dare not attempt a distinction between the term and the phrase. Their meaning is one. The little children are brought to Christ—infants are brought to the pedobaptist. The disciples forbade the little children—Baptists forbid the infants. Christ took the little children in his arms—the pedobaptist takes the infants in his arms. Christ put his hands on the little children—the pedobaptist puts his hands on the infants. Could two peas be more alike? Christ blessed the little children—the pedobaptist blesses the infants, for even the dullest cannot deny that baptism is a real blessing to the little things. Reason must have vacated its seat when the like of this fails to convince. True, it is not said that Christ *baptized* the little children; but then it is said he blessed them, and the distinction between that blessing and the baptism of the pedobaptist is not worth the drawing. But now for the arguments, the first of which may be stated as follows:

V. The conduct of Christ in the case in hand clearly proves that little children are entitled to the blessings of his reign. Baptism is one of these blessings. Therefore little children are entitled to it.

Now what the conduct of Christ clearly proves is this: that during his earthly life, little children might be brought to him and receive at his own hands a blessing, of the nature and import of which we know nothing. But what his conduct does not prove is this: that because little children might receive that blessing, which is not known to be a blessing of his reign, therefore, they may be baptized. This is what his conduct does not prove. That blessing was one thing—the blessings of his reign are different things. A person may enjoy all these and not have that, or he may have that and not be entitled to these. That blessing was bestowed before Christ's reign commenced, and therefore is not

necessarily one of it. The blessings of his reign were subsequently appointed, and are not known to include that; hence in no sense can the bestowment of one be construed as entitling to the other. The argument is at fault in two respects. First, and chiefly, the main assertion is false. It is not true that the conduct of Christ proves that infants are entitled to all the blessings of his reign. This may be so; but then it can never be deduced from the conduct in question. A right to all the blessings of his reign can never be inferred from the bestowment of a single blessing before his reign began. Second, the minor premise affirms that baptism is a blessing. Now this is not true. Baptism is a duty, not a blessing. When baptism is classified as a blessing, the classification is utterly faulty. True, the duty may involve blessings; blessings may depend on it; but then the duty itself is not a blessing—especially is it not a blessing in the sense in which Christ blessed little children. The second argument may be stated thus:

VI. All whom the kingdom of heaven contains are entitled to baptism. The clause, "of such is the kingdom of heaven," implies that it contains infants. Therefore they are entitled to baptism.

This argument and the fourth resemble each other so closely, that, though really distinct, they may be treated much alike. They both stand high in the favor of pedobaptists, this, perhaps, enjoying the preference. It is seldom we look into a treatise of any note on infant baptism, especially if it be a recent one, without finding a decided prominence given to this argument. Conspicuous, though in a somewhat varied form, it reappears in almost every public discussion of the doctrine in hand. It can be made just plausible enough to lead an incautious thinker, where ardently devoted to the cause of infant baptism, to swallow it as completely conclusive. It is on that very account the more dangerous. I shall give it the benefit of a very sufficient examination.

All whom the kingdom of heaven contains are entitled to baptism. A more complete misconception of the truth than this implies we should find it difficult to adduce. And yet there is a subtle danger in the assertion. Can it be possible that there are any in the kingdom of heaven who are not entitled to baptism? Let us imagine a sanguine pedobaptist putting the question to himself. Not for a moment can he believe it. The flattering thought now flashes home to his heart, that if his children are in the kingdom, then conclusively are they entitled to baptism. With him it is folly to reason further. Now of course the real question on the assertion is this: does the kingdom of heaven contain any who

are not baptized? The answer is, not one. All whom it contains have been already baptized. Without baptism they had never been in it. The assertion is therefore false. Hence, the proper method of treating it is, to deny it, and thereby devolve the proof on the affirmant, which must at once strand him. Or if the denial does not strand him, it will at least compel him to shift the ground of controversy to the minor. Then will arise the question of fact, does the clause, "of such is the kingdom of heaven," imply that the kingdom contains infants? To this the advocate of infant baptism replies with a strong affirmative. How now, in order to sustain himself, must he construe the clause? He must assume that the phrase, "of such," expresses not likeness or resemblance, but identity; in other words, that the phrase, "of such," is wrong, and should give place to the phrase, *of these*. The passage would then read, of these, that is, of little children, is the kingdom of heaven. But to this, though the exact ground the proponent of the argument must take, there are two insuperable objections. 1. The word rendered "of such," can never be rendered *of these*. It (*τοιούτων*) means *of this kind, of such as these*, denoting likeness or resemblance—it never means simply and absolutely *these*, excluding comparison. To assert that the kingdom of heaven is composed of those who are like little children, who resemble them in one or more respects, and that it is composed of little children, is to assert two very different things. 2. The kingdom of heaven does not consist of little children. Pedobaptists themselves do not believe it. They believe that the kingdom of heaven is composed of both adults and infants. Yet if their exegesis of the phrase "of such" is correct, their belief is false. For if the phrase means *of these*, then the Saviour's assertion amounts to this, that the kingdom of heaven is composed of little children alone, which excludes adults. Are pedobaptists prepared for this?

One paragraph more and we are done with the passage. The language of the common version is not just to the sense of the original. It makes the Saviour speak of all children, or of children generally; in other words, it makes him say, suffer all little children to come to me: whereas, the original makes him speak only of the children then and there present, the children whom the disciples were forbidding to come to him. The correct rendering of the passage as recorded in all three of the Evangelists is—suffer *the* little children to come to me, that is, the little children whom you are forbidding. This reference is to these and no others. The presence of the article is designed to indicate this. I cite next the following:

"And Jesus came, and spake to them, saying, all power is given

to me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." The argument based on this passage is the following:

VII. The word nations certainly includes infants. Christ commanded the apostles to baptize nations; and hence, by necessary implication, to baptize infants.

It must be conceded that the common version of the Bible as just cited warrants this conclusion. It is uncandid to deny this; and although we may know that it is false, yet we know it not from the passage itself, but from other sources. But is the passage in this particular correct, or does it truly express the sense of the original? I answer, it does not. Let us then correct it.

In the original the word nations is not the antecedent of the word them. Nations is neuter gender, while them is masculine; hence, by no law known to the language can the latter be relative to the former. Of course the common version being unfaithful in this respect is so far void. Hence the argument in hand, which assumes that them is relative to nations, and which has no validity except as this assumption is true, is unsound and its conclusion is false.

But since nations is not the antecedent of them, I shall perhaps be asked what its antecedent is? I reply, the antecedent is not expressed, but is implied; and that this is according to a well known law of the original governing this very case. The law is this: "The word to which an adjective or pronoun is referred, is sometimes merely *implied* in some preceding word, or suggested by the nature of the context. This is particularly the case in the New Testament with the demonstrative pronoun *αὐτός*." Now this is the pronoun employed in the passage in hand, and whose masculine plural is rendered them. To this *ἐθνῶν* (nation), a neuter noun, can never be antecedent; and yet it is so according to the common version. But in which word of the sentence is the antecedent implied? Of course in some one which implies a *masculine* antecedent. Now there is but a single word in the sentence which can imply it, namely—*μαθητεύω*. The noun implied in this is *μαθητής*—a masculine noun, the plural of which is unquestionably the true implied antecedent of them. The following free rendering will indicate the exact sense of the passage: Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, and when by teaching you make disciples baptize them, i. e., the disciples. From all of which it appears that the foregoing argument has no foundation in truth, and that its conclusion is hence false.

But the argument is at fault in another respect—it proves too much. Hence the principle from which it results must be false;

for, from a principle true in itself, a false conclusion can never be drawn, if drawn correctly. The argument assumes that infants are to be baptized because included in the word nations. But the word nations includes also infidels, atheists, and idolaters; and are these to be baptized merely because included in the word? Obviously not. Consequently the argument is completely false. Indeed, it is a sad proof of human weakness, if not of something worse, that infant baptism should have the strong hold it has on many a mind, and yet that there should not exist even one argument in its favor having a single true sinew to knit its parts together. All are alike unsound, incoherent, and even to the shortest vision palpably inconclusive. Clearly argument and reason are not the ground on which infant baptism rests. Something more potent than these constitutes its basis; but what that something is I stop not here to inquire.

I shall, perhaps, hardly be excused for citing the following passage, and noticing the stupid use often made of it. My apology is the fact of its frequent employment in connection with infant baptism. When a passage is often quoted to prove a doctrine, the doctrine and the passage at length become permanently associated in the popular mind, and the doctrine is inferred from the passage merely because they are thus associated. True, the people do not see the doctrine in the passage, but then they think it must be there, otherwise the passage would not be cited to prove it. The passage is this: "Then Peter said to them, repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. *For the promise is to you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call.*" The italic letters indicate the part employed in support of infant baptism. The argument based on this part as far as I can reduce it to any conceivable form—a thing which I find almost impossible—is this:

VIII. The promise in the passage refers to baptism, and involves the right of all the promisees to the thing promised. Children are expressly declared to be a part of these promisees. Therefore they have a right to baptism.

Now is it true that the promise in the passage refers to baptism? Certainly it is not so said, neither does it so appear on inspecting the passage. The assertion is groundless, and hence, no basis for an argument. But to what, if not to baptism, does the promise refer? Evidently to the Holy Spirit. To make this clear it is only necessary to cite first, verse 33, and then verses 38 and 39. First, verse 33—"Therefore, being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father *the promise of the*

Holy Spirit," that is, having received the Holy Spirit which was promised, "he (Christ) hath shed forth this which ye now see and hear." Next, verses. 38 and 39—"Then Peter said to them, repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. For the promise is to you and your children," that is, you shall receive the Holy Spirit as a gift; for the promise that you shall receive it is to you and to your children. The promise then refers to the Holy Spirit, and not to baptism. This is fatal to the argument.

But the argument labors under another difficulty. The word children which the passage contains has no reference to *infants*, but to descendants, and as the facts show to adult descendants. "For the promise is to you and to your children and to all that are afar off, *even as many as the Lord our God shall call*. The children referred to, therefore, are old enough to be *called* by the gospel, and hence, not infants. They are children it is true, but children in the sense in which Abraham at the age of a hundred and twenty was the child of Terah.

The argument to be next noticed rests on the following: "And when she (Lydia) was baptized, and her household, ~~she~~ besought us, saying, if ye have judged me to be faithful to the Lord, come into my house and abide there. And she constrained us." From this they deduce the following:

IX. The entire household of Lydia was baptized. This household contained an infant. Hence an infant was baptized.

All this being either conceded or proved, it would then readily follow that infant baptism has apostolic sanction, and is therefore right. How much then may we concede, and how much can be proved? For the sake of shortening strife it may be conceded that all of Lydia's household were baptized. . But did this household contain an infant? Dare even a pedobaptist assert it? Not one of them will say it; and yet they argue for infant baptism from the baptism of Lydia's family. Their argument, in short, is this: Lydia *may* have had an infant, and she *may not*; this infant *may* have been baptized, and it *may not*; therefore infant baptism is right. Clearly if Lydia had no infant, none was baptized; hence the first thing necessary is to show that she had an infant. But this can never be done. The very most that can be said of her case is, that she may have had an infant, which of course implies that she may not. From this nothing can be inferred. Never was a cause more baseless than that of infant baptism.

The stronghold of the doctrine is beyond all question the baptism of households. But before any thing satisfactory can be deduced from these cases two things must be clearly shown: 1.

That every member of the household was baptized. It is best to concede this, not because it is true, but because the concession saves both time and talk. 2. That some one of the households did certainly contain an infant. This being impossible ends the controversy. After the case of Lydia I shall add nothing on the other household baptisms. The argument from one is the argument from all; hence when refuted in the case of one, it is refuted in the case of all.

It is proper to remark here that I have availed myself of none of the materials at hand capable of being used to show that no infants were baptized in any of the households named. I have contented myself with simply showing what the affirmant of infant baptism must do before his doctrine becomes credible. This I have deemed the better course. It is useless to attempt, by the use of any means, to refute what is certainly not proved; but it is very proper, where a thing is assumed to be proved, to show that it is not proved, and also what is necessary to its proof.

I have now, in the preceding sketch, disposed of the main grounds on which infant baptism rests. In executing this task I have paid no attention to such arguments as are sometimes adduced from ecclesiastic history, and relate to the antiquity of the practice, its prevalence, or the intelligence and piety of those who believe in it. All these arguments I leave unmolested in the hands of those who can stoop to use them, and who depend more on declamation to establish their cause than on sense or Scripture. Such arguments serve no purpose save to pander to the pride of party and the pride of the flesh, and hence with men of a just regard to truth deserve no special notice.

I am now prepared to state objections to infant baptism. Of course, if the doctrine be false, this cannot be deemed very necessary; yet it has its value, and should not be omitted. In stating these objections no attempt is made at disproof proper, neither is any single objection designed to be conclusive. They are intended to have a collective force.

1st. *There is a strong presumption that the doctrine is a falsehood.*

Unquestionably it is no where actually asserted in the Bible; and whatever, as a doctrine, is not thus taught, wears on its very front the deep suspicion of falsehood. Were the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, of the resurrection of the dead, and of the blessedness of heaven, no where actually asserted in the word of God, in what estimate would these themes be held. On them men would have been forever wild; immortality would never have floated in our dreams; nor heaven breathed in the poet's line. Indeed, in that case it is doubtful whether a future state or the resurrection from the dead would ever have mingled in our

thoughts, unless placed there by some vagrant tradition from forfeited Eden. The Bible certainly would never have placed either there. The only guarantee we have in any case that a doctrine is divine is the fact that the Bible roundly asserts it. Whatever lacks this assurance, and infant baptism certainly lacks it, has but a feeble claim on the faith of the world.

2d. *It puts a lie in the lips of all who claim for it that it is impliedly taught in the Bible.*

Now whatever does this deserves, not the confidence, but the execration of all true men. With infant baptism *per se* we could have no quarrel whatever, no more than with the kind of frock an infant wears. What we object to, is, that it compels its advocates to lie when it requires them to say that it is implied in the word of God.

3d. *It has prostituted the minds of its abettors to false methods of distinguishing truth from error.*

Not only has it done this heretofore as a fact, but it still continues to do it uniformly and necessarily. Without this it could not exist a day. As a doctrine it is neither asserted nor implied in the Bible; nor as a practice is it either enjoined or authorized by precedent. Still, though thus groundless, it exists, and, without evidence, is believed. Hence the methods by which it is maintained must be false, since true methods could never lead to such results. Nor do the evils under this head end here. Every false method of distinguishing the truth, which is allowed to settle in the soul, enervates it, blunts its intuitions, and renders its redemption the more difficult. Besides, false methods of discriminating truth are, in fact, false methods of reasoning; and the reasoning faculty once broken down by them never acts reliably afterwards. I never saw a pedobaptist that reasoned soundly. Their whole mental frame, as it respects reasoning, seems to be a wreck. A constant straining of the mind to defend error, at length so perverts all the natural channels of thought as to render correct reasoning impossible. Such are some of the bad effects of infant baptism.

4th. *It annuls, in effect, the distinction between the divine will and human cunning, making them of equal value as the source of religious action.*

Infant baptism did not originate in the divine will; yet it exists—exists then, by human cunning. Not only does it exist; but it claims to be placed on the same footing with other practices which did, as all agree, originate in the divine will; and this claim is granted, and it is so placed. Hence since it enjoys the same favor and has the same force with those who accept it, as though originating in the divine will, that will consequently has no advantage over human cunning in originating and giving

effect to religious action. They are, with those who accept infant baptism, equal.

5th. *Infant baptism cumbers parents with a sense of duty where the Bible leaves them free.*

It claims to be enjoined in the word of God; and as the infant cannot baptize itself, of course it becomes the duty of the parent either to do it himself or have it done. This creates a sense of duty. Under this sense of duty the parent often becomes painfully anxious. Some delay is almost unavoidable; is he therefore criminal? The infant may die without it; how has his neglect affected its future fate? And all this about a matter of which the Bible knows nothing.

6th. *It causes parents to teach their children lies.*

When children reach the age at which they can understand, their parents tell them that when infants they were proper subjects of baptism—this is false; that they were then baptized—this is false; for sprinkling is not baptism; that the holy Bible enjoins this baptism—this is false; that in virtue of their baptism they are now in the church of Christ—and this is false. Here, now, are four lies; and with them, in conscience, let the list be closed.

7th. *It plants a delusion in the heart of the child.*

When grown the child is taught that it has been consecrated to God in baptism; that, in virtue thereof, it sustains to him new and peculiar relations; that it is now under obligations from which other children are free; and that these obligations cannot be contemned or slighted without exposure to the wrath of heaven. The child either accepts this teaching as true, and thus feels itself bound in the sight of God; or it treats it with indifference, and from being indifferent it becomes either reckless or in its own eye a guilty rebel against the just government of God. Yet for all this there exists not the shadow of a foundation in the Bible.

8th. *It causes children in many cases to become permanently disobedient to the divine government.*

Many children, on growing up, refuse to be baptized, on the ground of having been baptized in infancy. In this they persist through life. They thus live in open and continued rebellion against the authority of Christ. How far this may be overlooked by him we cannot say; but whether it may not possibly jeopard the future happiness of the child, it certainly concerns parents with deep solicitude to inquire.

9th. *It is a tradition and as such makes void the law of Christ.*

Did infant baptism prevail universally, the injunction to baptize would stand as an obsolete statute on the sacred page. Thus Christ's authority would be insulted, his wisdom pronounced

defective, and the church become universally corrupt. These results most clearly indicate whence infant baptism has its origin.

10th *It abrogates the law of entrance into the kingdom of heaven.*

Christ says, "except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God;" and when he says of an event it *cannot* be, I am simple enough to pronounce it impossible. Yet, "not so," say the advocates of infant baptism, "sprinkle the child in infancy and it shall enter the kingdom of God." Now if Christ be wrong they may be right; but if he is right, alas for them who pronounce his teachings false!

11th. *It is absolutely destitute of even one blessing to the child.*

This of itself is enough to degrade infant baptism forever from the respect of all who can be governed either by reason or the word of God. Whatever is fraught with no benefit to man, either within itself or by divine appointment, is no doctrine of the Bible. And such is infant baptism. Unknown to the Bible, unsanctioned by reason, undemanded by necessity, it yet exists. Will the time ever come, we ask in the name of outraged truth and deluded humanity, when the world shall learn to know, that, in vain, we attempt to worship Christ by teaching for doctrine the commandments of men? If so, kind heaven speed the day.

KENTUCKY MISSIONARY SOCIETY.—This Society held its regular annual Meeting in Lexington in October last. I believe every brother in attendance left the Meeting happy and glad that he had been there. No political resolutions marred the harmony of the occasion. Brethren nobly forgot that they had ever differed on these worldly themes, met each other as Christians, worshiped God with a lofty devotion, and parted as if something more than kin. We wish it were so everywhere.

The most important act of the Meeting was the appointment of a Corresponding Secretary whose duty it was made to visit the various churches of the State and enlist them more generally and heartily in the missionary work. To this responsible and laborious trust the Meeting had the sagacity to appoint Brother Thomas Munnell. A more worthy and competent hand could not perform this service. We bespeak for him the active co-operation of every preaching brother in the State, and a liberal response in material aid from all the churches. Brethren, give this true man no occasion to hang down his head over a failure. We want to be proud of his work and proud of you that help him. Address him at Mt. Sterling, and get one of his circulars. This will give you full particulars as to his plans, and it is highly necessary that you should know them.

RE P E N T A N C E.

THE importance of thoroughly understanding the conditions of pardon can not well be exaggerated. We speak now, not of understanding what these conditions are, but of possessing a thorough and separate knowledge of each one of them. That faith, repentance, and immersion are the conditions of pardon as respects the unconverted, is well understood among the disciples, and has been widely proclaimed by them to the world. There are some speakers and writers, indeed, of a class who cannot long remain contented even with the truth, who have become wearied with the discussion of these topics, and have almost entirely abandoned it. The consequence is that hundreds of sinners are brought into the church who pass through the required forms more because the church requires it, than because they see that they are complying with the indispensable conditions of pardon. In the meantime the church in a great degree loses its identity, and forgets that there is any thing grand and attractive in the plea for primitive Christianity. Sometimes the members of such a church hear so much of the points in which sectarian parties are claimed to be far ahead of us, that they would feel gratified to be assured that they and their brethren generally are only a little behind the sects of the day.

The chief defect with such speakers is that they have never studied these elementary themes sufficiently to understand them thoroughly, or to preach them successfully. It would be a curious experiment to call upon each individual preacher and writer among us to furnish, *ex tempore*, a definition of *faith*, or of *repentance*. How many there are who would be prepared with a prompt answer, it would be hazardous to affirm; but the little observation we have made justifies the presumption that the best definitions would not be given by those who have become weary with "preaching faith, repentance, and baptism."

A failure to exercise close thought, and clear discrimination upon these themes, like a slight variation of the mariner's compass when starting on a long voyage, may lead to wide and disastrous departures from the pathway of truth. They not only constitute the starting point of the Christian life, but they serve as a key to unlock the doors of the temple of truth on that side of it where Protestants are struggling to get in.

We have not assigned ourselves the task of enlarging the field of view on all three of these topics, although on all it is much needed; but propose only to get the subject of repentance into a

little clearer light. There is certainly much in the conceptions of both Catholics and Protestants, and even of some among our own brethren, to encourage such an attempt. By substituting in their translations, "Do penance," for the command "Repent," the Catholic priesthood impose upon their deluded victims all forms of self-torture as a means of atonement for sins. By a misunderstanding of the nature of repentance, the victims of Protestant error are wrought up to groans, and tears, and outcries, which are often protracted through days and weeks together, or terminate in fits and spasms assumed to be the work of the Holy Spirit. And what is still more surprising, some one appears occasionally among the disciples to argue that men must repent before they believe. So long as this state of things continues, there will continue to be an imperative demand for close study of this subject, and for persistent proclamation of the truth concerning it.

The prevalent confusion upon this subject in the minds of those who read the Bible in English, is owing in part to the fact that in our version the word *repent* represents and confounds two Greek words quite distinct in their meaning. These words are *μετανοέω* and *μεταμέλομαι*. Dr. George Campbell, in his Dissertation on *μετανοέω* and *μεταμέλομαι*, has proved that they are used differently in the New Testament, by showing that wherever the duty or doctrine of repentance is taught the inspired writers invariably use *μετανοέω*. This being so, in order to understand the subject of repentance we have only to search into the meaning and usage of this word.

The etymological meaning of *μετανοέω* is so apparent as to strike every mind at all acquainted with Greek. Compounded of *μετά* and *νοέω*, it signifies *to perceive afterwards*, and supposes its subject to think differently from what he did at some former time. It indicates, therefore, a *change of mind*, and *to change the mind* is the best expression in English of its primary meaning. We have an instance of this meaning in the New Testament, notwithstanding the following remark by Dr. Bloomfield: "*Μετάνοια* properly and primarily signifies a change of mind or purpose. But it is so rare in this sense that no commentator on the New Testament has adduced an example." The example I refer to is in the 12th of Hebrews, where Paul says of Esau who had sold his birthright, "You know that afterwards when he wished to inherit the blessing, he was rejected: for he found no place for *μετανοίας*, a *change of mind*, though he sought it carefully with tears." Now it was not sorrow for sin, nor any religious change, either in himself or in his father Isaac, that he was seeking; hence it is altogether improper to render the term here *repentance*. But Isaac had given

the blessing to Jacob, and Esau was entreating him to *change his mind* so as to take it back from Jacob and give it to him. The term *μετάνοια* is here used, therefore, not in its religious, but in its primary sense of simply *a change of mind*. So clearly is this the case, that it is quite surprising to hear Dr. George Campbell, who admits that the change Esau sought was such as we have described, say, "I acknowledge that it is only by a trope that this can be called either *μετάνοια* or *μεταμέλεια*." He undoubtedly fell into this mistake by retaining in his mind the religious sense of *μετάνοια*.

A word often acquires some modification of its primary signification by being employed in connection with a new subject; and especially is this the case when, in its new connection, it becomes, as *μετάνοια* has, a kind of technical term. In all such cases, however, the primary meaning furnishes a key to the acquired signification. In searching, therefore, for the New Testament meaning of *μετάνοια*, we shall be aided by bearing in mind its primary sense. When the Greek-speaking Athenians first heard from the lips of Paul, that God, who had hitherto overlooked the idolatry of the Gentiles, was now commanding all men every where *μετανοεῖν* *to repent*; this word necessarily conveyed to them the idea of a change of mind, and the connection further showed that the required change had reference to the worship of idols and the service due the true God. If we would seek for a still more accurate conception of this change, we must start with the primary sense of the word as a foundation, and allow this to be modified and limited by the connections in which we find it employed, until we ascertain its exact force in apostolic usage.

Dr. George Campbell, and some others after him have insisted that the apostolic sense of *μετάνοια* is *reformation*. Now reformation is a change of *conduct*, not a change of *mind*. True, it *implies* a pre-existing change of mind, but it differs from a change of mind as an effect differs from its cause. If, then, *μετάνοια* is used in the sense of reformation, it must be by a metonymy which puts the cause for the effect.

We can settle this question only by a careful examination of New Testament usage. In many passages either of these meanings would harmonize with the context, but there are some which forbid the sense contended for by Dr. Campbell. When John the Immerser says, "Bring forth *fruits* worthy of *repentance*," by *fruits* he evidently means those acts of a better life which constitute reformation. He styles them fruits worthy of or suitable to repentance, because they are acts which one who has repented will do. But here repentance and reformation are contemplated

as two distinct things, the latter being demanded as a suitable *result* of the former. Repentance, then, with John, is not a change of conduct, but a change of mind. The same distinction is observed in Peter's command, "repent and turn;" where *turning* to God, which is the essential thought in reformation, is distinguished from repentance. Again, when Jesus says "if your brother trespass against you seven times in a day, and seven times in a day turn again to you, saying I *repent*, you shall forgive him;" it is clear that the offender is supposed to express by the words *I repent*, a change of mind, and only an *intended* change of conduct. It is true that his turning again and saying "I repent," is in itself a partial change of conduct; but this the offended party could see, and need not be told of it. The change which the offender wishes to make known must have been unseen, and therefore a change in the mind. Moreover, reformation is a change of too permanent a nature to be accomplished in reference to the same misconduct *seven times in a day*. So clearly is this the case that Dr. George Campbell, the original champion of the term *reform*, felt compelled in this passage to retain the word *repent*. He renders the passage, "if thy brother trespass against thee, rebuke him; and if μετανοήσῃ *he repent*, forgive him; and if he trespass against thee seven times in a day, and seven times in a day return to thee saying μετανοῶ 'I repent,' thou shalt forgive him."¹ The incongruity of representing a man as offending you seven times in a day, and each time coming to you to say "*I reform*," forced him to return here to a rendering which he had theoretically repudiated. We need look no further for proof that μετάνοια means a change of mind, and not of conduct. We have now ascertained, however, that reformation is a fruit of the change represented by μετάνοια, and this may assist us in the sequel in limiting the meaning of the latter term.

Seeing, now, that μετάνοια carries its primary signification with it into the New Testament, we are next led to inquire what specific change of mind it designates. The mind includes the intellect, the will, and the sensibilities. To be exact in our conceptions we must locate the change expressed by μετάνοια in one or more of these. The Westminster Confession of Faith, which has exerted a more controlling influence over Protestant minds than any other creed extant, defines the change in these words: "Repentance unto life is a saving grace, wrought in the heart of the sinner by the Spirit and word of God, whereby out of the sight and sense, not only of the danger, but also of the filthiness and odiousness of his sins, and upon the apprehension of God's mercy in Christ to such as are penitent, he so grieves for and hates his

¹ Campbell's Four Gospels." Lu. xvii : 3-4.

sins, as that he turns from them all to God, purposing and endeavoring constantly to walk with him in all the ways of new obedience." A most bunglesome definition, truly; and sufficiently obscure to make us thank God that he has not left us to man-made creeds for our knowledge of divine things. Upon a careful analysis of it, however, we find that it declares repentance to consist in a certain grief for and hatred of sin. All the clauses of the definition which precede this, declare only the causes which lead to repentance; and all that follow declare only the results of it. The change itself is located in the emotional nature, and is well expressed in popular phraseology by the words, "godly sorrow for sin."

We must now examine the term in the light of limiting words and clauses, and see if this definition is correct. Paul says to the Corinthians, in reference to an epistle which had grieved them: "Now I rejoice, not that you were made sorry, but that you sorrowed *εἰς μετάνοιαν* to repentance. For godly sorrow *ἔργα* *μετάνοιαν* repentance to salvation not to be repented of." Here it is declared that godly sorrow *works* or *produces* repentance, and that the Corinthians sorrowed *to* repentance. Godly sorrow for sin, then, and repentance are two distinct things, the latter being a *result* of the former. The same distinction is apparent in Peter's discourse on Pentecost. When he said to the people "repent and be immersed," they were already pierced to the heart with sorrow for sin, and were crying out "what shall we do?" Repentance, then, was to follow this sorrow for sin, and was the next change to take place. To confound the two is to confound a cause with its effect; the same mistake which we have already exposed in Dr. Campbell's definition. The latter by defining *μετάνοια* reformation, puts the effect for the cause; while to define it as *sorrow for sin* puts the cause for the effect.

We now have before us premises sufficient for ascertaining with accuracy the definition we are seeking. Repentance is a change in the mind. It is produced by sorrow for sin, and it leads to a change of conduct. Now the only change of mind which sorrow for sin does produce, and which, in turn, leads to reformation, is a change in the will. No change of a moral character takes place which does not immediately spring from the will; and sorrow for past misconduct can effect no reformation except by changing the *will* which controls all action. To be philosophically accurate, therefore, we must define it as *a change of the will produced by sorrow for sin and leading to reformation*. This definition is accurate; for it definitely locates the change of mind. It is complete; for it indicates both the cause to which the sacred

writers attribute it, and the efforts by which its reality is tested. It is free from redundancy; for a change of will produced by other considerations than sorrow for sin, or one which failed to produce a change of conduct, would certainly not be the repentance of which the apostles spake.

Having now fixed the exact Scriptural meaning of *μετάνοια*, we next inquire what is its best representative in English. The Catholic version, "do penance," is so far from the truth as to need no comment whatever. We have also demonstrated that Dr. Campbell's rendering, "reform," is not true to the original. As to the term *repentance*, it is used in popular speech, and defined in popular creeds, in a sense which likewise fails to give the true idea. We have seen, however, in the course of our investigation, that this term is found in the *English Testament* under limitations which make it the exact representative of the original term. In this state of case, if we had some other term of exactly the same import, and free from the inaccurate popular sense which attaches to *repentance*, our recourse would be obvious and easy. We would adopt that term in our version and our speech, and thus at once remove all confusion on the subject by employing an unambiguous word. This has been done in reference to the term *baptism*. Having acquired, in popular usage, a sense different from that which it bears in the *English Testament*, the substitution therein of the term *immersion* at once removes all ambiguity, and restores to the English its original fidelity to the Greek. But, unfortunately, our language furnishes no such term for our present purpose. We are left, therefore, to the necessity of retaining the word *repentance*, and compelling our cotemporaries by its usage in the *English Testament*, to see and acknowledge its true meaning.

The efficacy of this expedient, however, depends in part upon the condition that *μεταμέλομαι* be not also rendered *repent*. Unless it has the same meaning with *μετανοέω*, it certainly should be rendered by some other word than *repent* in order to bring out its true meaning. We have already observed the fact stated by Dr. Campbell, that this term is never used when the *duty* of repentance is spoken of. The same author also observes that *μετανοέω* "denotes properly a change to the better;" but *μεταμέλομαι* "barely a change, whether it be to the better or worse." This remark is true with some qualification. It is strictly true in reference to *μεταμέλομαι*. In reference to *μετανοέω* it is true only as respects its *religious* usage. In its primary sense, in which Paul uses it for the change of Isaac's mind sought by Esau, it is not clear that the change was to be for the better. When connected with matters of duty, however, it always supposes some previous wrong-doing

and requires a change for the better. But μεταμέλομαι is used even in reference to a good act; as when Paul says, "though I grieved you with a letter, *οὐ μεταμέλομαι I do not repent*, though *μεταμελόμην, I did repent*; for I perceive that that letter grieved you only for an hour." Now this version makes him say he had *repented* of writing the first epistle to the Corinthians, which was a good deed. He cannot mean that he had undergone a change of will produced by sorrow for sin and leading to reformation, for there was no sin in the case, and so far was he from reforming that he was now repeating the deed by writing another letter. This makes it perfectly clear that μεταμέλομαι is used in a sense different from that which we have found attached to μετανοέω.

What, then, is the exact meaning of μεταμέλομαι? Dr. Campbell, in his celebrated dissertation says it means "*I repent*, in the familiar acceptation of the word." Now in its familiar acceptation repent means to be sorry for *sin*; and to say, I repent of an action, implies that I consider it a sinful action. But such is not the force of μεταμέλομαι, seeing it is used in reference to that which is *no sin*. Paul so used it in the passage just quoted above, and also in the following: "Godly sorrow works repentance in order to salvation *ἀμεταμέλητον not to be repented of*." "The Lord sware and *οὐ μεταμελήσεται will not repent*. Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek." In all these passages the term *repent*, even in its popular sense, is entirely incongruous, for it contemplates a change from sin, and there is no room for the thought of sin in either case. From the passage in reference to the Corinthian letter, however, we can determine the exact import of the word by asking ourselves what change must have taken place in Paul's mind. He learned that the letter had grieved the Corinthians, and a knowledge of this caused the feeling which he expresses by μεταμέλομαι; but this feeling passed away when he heard that their grief brought them to repentance. Now the only feeling which a good man would experience, under such circumstances, is expressed in the term *regret*. This is the exact feeling that would be awakened, and when it was known that the pain inflicted had resulted in the desired benefit, the good man would regret no longer. This much and no more, then, can we make out of Paul's words, and this meaning suits exactly the other two passages. "Godly sorrow works repentance in order to salvation not to be *regretted*," and "the Lord sware, and will not *regret it*. Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek."

Thus far we have examined the usage of μεταμέλομαι only as connected with good deeds. When connected with evil actions, as in the case of Judas, and of the young man who first refused

to work in his father's vineyard, but afterwards *regretted* it and went, it of course expresses regret for *sin*. But it is evident that the idea of sin arises entirely from the connection in which it is used. Judas experienced a feeling more intense than our term regret ordinarily expresses, and a verb formed from *remorse*, if we had one, would come nearer expressing it; but we learn this not from the term *μεταμέλομαι*, but from the fact that he threw down the money and went and hung himself. The term, therefore, even here, *expresses* no more than regret, but the context shows that it was a degree of regret equivalent to remorse. We conclude, then, that *regret* is the proper representative of *μεταμέλομαι* in all its occurrences, and by the adoption of it in our version all danger of confounding it with the repentance necessary to salvation would be removed.

Dr. Conant, in his labors for the American Bible Union, introduced this rendering of *μεταμέλομαι* in the first edition of his version of Matthew, and if he had retained it he would have deserved the thanks of the English reading community. But in the last edition of his work this valuable step in advance is retraced, and his readers left to the old confusion of the common version.

Having now traced the distinction between these two Greek words, we can more definitely locate the point of contact, which sometimes exists between them. We say *sometimes*, because when *μεταμέλομαι* has reference to an act not in itself sinful, it can have no connection whatever with repentance. But when it has reference to sins committed, it expresses that sorrow for sin, of which, when it is sufficient to change the will, repentance is the result. Repentance always springs from *regret* for sin; but regret, even when so intense as to lead to suicide, may fail of producing repentance, by failing to change the will so as to produce reformation.

A great deal of the error and confusion extant upon religious topics may be dissipated by correct definition of terms. It is for want of correct definition of both faith and repentance that the latter has been supposed to precede the former in the order of mental operations. The advocates of this error suppose repentance to be sorrow for sin, and saving faith to consist in yielding up the will to Christ; and knowing that sorrow for sin necessarily precedes a change of the will, they very readily and quite confidently reach the conclusion that repentance must precede saving faith. Their fundamental mistake consists in confounding repentance with sorrow for sin, which leads to it, and then confounding faith with what is really repentance. The change of will, as we have seen above, constitutes repentance and not faith.

When, by a correct definition of repentance, it is seen that it occupies the very place assigned by these errorists to faith, it is at once apparent that it does not and cannot *precede* faith.

We do not forget that in two passages of Scripture, where Mark is describing the preaching of Jesus, and where Paul speaks of his own preaching in Ephesus, the arrangement of the terms seems to make repentance antedate faith. Jesus preached saying, "repent and believe the gospel;" and Paul preached "repentance towards God and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ." Now it is not denied that repentance towards God may precede faith in Jesus Christ. It necessarily did so with all who repented under John's preaching, for they repented toward God before the Messiahship of Jesus was preached to them. It is true also that the preaching of Jesus and of Paul may have brought many men to repentance toward the God in whom they already believed, before they were convinced that Jesus is the Christ. But it is denied that repentance toward God can precede faith in God; or repentance toward Christ, faith in Christ. This denial is sustained by the facts just referred to; for the very foundation of the repentance preached to Jews and proselytes was the faith they already had in the God of Israel. And it is also sustained by the fact that even the advocates of this theory find themselves compelled to admit a certain kind of faith before repentance; and as we have seen above, the kind of faith which they locate after repentance is really repentance itself.

There is another passage in our common version, which, to the mere English reader, would offer stronger support to the theory of repentance before faith than those just noticed. It is the statement of Jesus to the Pharisees, "John came to you in the way of righteousness, and you believed him not; but the publicans and harlots believed him; and you, when you had seen it, *repented* not afterwards *that you might* believe him." Here repentance seems not only to precede faith, but to be necessary in order that men *might* believe. But, unfortunately for our theorists, the original term is *μεταμέλομαι*, not *μετανοέω*. It was *regret* and not *repentance* which the Pharisees should have experienced. This shows that the passage does not teach repentance before faith; but still it leaves *regret* before faith, and suggests the inquiry how a man can regret not having believed, before he does believe, and in order that he *may* believe. He certainly could not do it unless the cause of his not having believed was something wrong in himself. But this was precisely the case with the Pharisees. It was their spiritual *pride* which made them reject the ministry of John, causing them to shut their eyes against the proofs of his mission. When, now, they saw even publicans and harlots act-

ing more candidly toward him than themselves, and becoming righteous under his teaching, they should have been filled with regret and even shame; and this feeling would have removed the obstacle to their faith. This very regret, however, necessarily presupposes faith even while opening the way to a new object of faith. The pre-existing faith of the Pharisees in God furnished the ground for regret that they had allowed the publicans and harlots to outstrip them in righteousness, while this *regret* would have prepared their minds for a new object of faith, the divine mission of John.

The Calvinistic idea that repentance is a direct gift from God is refuted by our definition, and at the same time those passages in which repentance is said to be *granted* to men are made plain. Consisting in a *volition*, or *change of will*, it cannot possibly be an immediate gift; and to call it so is no less absurd than to speak of an *involuntary volition*. But consisting of a change of will produced by sorrow for sin, he who supplies the considerations which awaken this sorrow may be properly said to *give* repentance. But God's goodness, on the one hand, and his final punishment of sin, on the other, furnish the means, as viewed by Jesus and the apostles, of exciting this sorrow; and, therefore, when repentance is induced it is, indirectly, a gift from God. Without the motives which God supplies no man could repent of his sins.

The devotees of the mourning bench have sometimes been troubled with the question: How long should a man repent before he is prepared for baptism? Our definition removes all possibility of making this a question; for repentance is a volition, and therefore must be instantaneous. The question really has reference to the sorrow which leads to repentance; and if it be pressed in this form, the answer must be, that the man must sorrow *to repentance* or a change of will, whether the time be long or short. The same is true as to the intensity of sorrow. Its entire value consists in its tendency to change the will; and he whose will is changed has sorrowed enough, and long enough. The jailer was immersed the same hour in which he began to sorrow for his sins, and Saul of Tarsus delayed only till he met with a disciple who could teach him his privilege and lead him into the water. The victims of protracted mourning at the present day, need only an Ananias to come and say, "Why do you tarry? Arise and be immersed and wash away your sins, calling on the name of the Lord."

Before dismissing this subject, we may observe that the preachers of the current reformation have been often charged with neglecting to enforce the duty of repentance. There never was a charge more unjust. So far is this from being true, that whilst they

have said no less than their cotemporaries upon the subject, they have outstripped them all in effecting that change of *will* which constitutes repentance. Their constant appeal to the sinner has been, *will* you abandon your sins, *will* you turn to God? Their arguments, their exhortations, their warnings, are all directed against the stubborn *will* of the sinner, which to change is to bring him to repentance. Their lamentation over the impenitent has ever been that of Jesus, "How often I would have gathered you together, but you *would* not," you were not *willing*; and their unceasing invitation is, "whosoever *will* let him take of the water of life freely." Without as clear a conception of repentance as they might have attained, they have yet been striking for it with an energy and a precision which has distanced all competition, and secured to them an unprecedented success in bringing sinners to Christ. That their conceptions may become still more accurate on this and on all the elementary themes of the gospel, and that their zeal and success may still more abound, is the greatest demand of the age in which we live.

KAPPA.

A TITLE FOR OUR PREACHERS.

A WHAT modest title to be used in correspondence with our preachers has long been felt to be a want amongst us. We are no stout advocate for titles certainly, but since they will be used, even by our brethren, let us have, at least, if such can be found, an appropriate one. The foolish and improper use of *Elder*, to which we are addicted, obviously calls for correction. Nothing can be more inappropriate than to apply it, as a title of vocation, to a youth scarcely out of his teens. And even when not so abused, it is seldom or never used correctly when applied to a preacher. A title should certainly be expressive, true, becoming, and free from affectation and vanity. Such a one I believe to be at hand in the very character and calling of the men to whom I am alluding.

I propose, then, that hereafter we append to a preacher's name when addressing him, where we attach any epithet at all, the simple letters C. P. as the initials of the words *Christian Preacher*. The word *Christian* tells what a man is, the word *preacher* what he *does*; and this is precisely what a title should express. John I. Rogers, C. P., would then be John I. Rogers, *Christian Preacher*. This is true of the man—a fact; is perfectly becoming and modest, and hence to us seems unexceptionable.

M. E. L.

SHALL WE RECOGNIZE OUR FRIENDS IN HEAVEN?

Few questions excite deeper emotions in the human breast than this. It will be asked whether we wish it or not. Even the effort to keep it out of the mind in fact keeps it in the mind. Up to the lip though unbidden it will rise, and there it awaits and still awaits a reply. It is neither shy nor timid, but steps boldly out in the very front of thought and presses its claim to be answered. Parley with it as we may, it will not be put off; philosophize on it as we can, it still is present. True the Holy Scriptures do not formally and directly raise the question; but then the heart of man does; and surely the question that is thus raised is not to be spurned as a bad thing. There lives not, there has not lived, a child of God, who has not asked the question. In all time since man learned that there is a heaven for the pure and good, has it been repeated. In the Christian's heart especially it throbs with a peculiar pleasure—a pleasure wild and sweet and painful. In this life we have friends—they shall leave us. In this life we have had friends—they are gone. Shall we meet them again? If approved of God we believe we shall. But shall we know them? know them as the friends we now know, or as the friends we still remember? Our kin are leaving or have left us. Shall we meet them again away hence? No profounder faith fills the heart than that we shall. But shall we know them, know them as our kin? Shall it one day be my lot to stand in the presence of ransomed forms resplendent with light and love and beauty, to gaze on faces, look into eyes, intently look, and say—it is mother, it is father, it is sister, it is brother? Shall I not meet and greet one there and fling my arms around her neck, and say—my wife, once my wife, my Mary still; and these my children, Lizzie, Jennie, my boys all? Is this a dream, all a dream, an idle dream, a dream of earth; is it a dream? The atheist tells me it is a dream, a whim, a frenzy. The skeptic hangs his doubt on it, wraps it in uncertainty, even where he does not roundly pronounce it a delusion. Many, very many, doubt it. Even the Christian is not quite certain of it. With him it may be true; but then again it may not be true. He is not confident, but doubts on which side the truth lies. How then shall we dispose of the question?

Shall we recognize our friends in heaven? Why not? It may be well before proceeding further to pause on this second question a little. If we are not to recognize them, to what will it be

owing? To some change, doubtless, in the mind itself. For if no change takes place in this, then recognition is simply certain. Should we remain there only as we are here, no better, no more perfect, even then is recognition certain. Here we forget much it is true, but there can we forget any thing? In this life we carry friends in mind even up to death itself. Nay, in many instances, the mind seems to be just then endowed with a strange power to call them up. Memory teems with them afresh. Even those long since forgotten then come glimmering back to view. Around no spot on earth do friends cluster so thick as around the dying bed. Now on what ground can it be thought that death extinguishes all these memories? On none, it seems to me, save on the ground that death extinguishes the spirit itself; and on this point I have nothing to say. If, I substantially repeat, on the approach of death the memory becomes more luminous, as we know in many instances it does, if the reproductive faculty becomes then more active, what ground have we to suppose that these all perish in death? The answer is, none.

But may not the change which the body is to undergo hereafter so affect the mind, its faculties and states, in heaven, as to render recognition impossible? or if not impossible, highly improbable? Why should it so affect the mind? The body is certainly to undergo some great change. But then this change will consist in spiritualizing the body, in rendering it more perfect, both as the abode and as the instrument of the mind. How, then, can such a change operate against recognition? That memory at present owes its imperfections to the depraved and feeble organism through which the mind works can hardly be questioned. Now, that perfecting this organism so that it shall become a help to the mind in all its operations and moods, instead of being a hinderance, as it now is, should go to prevent rather than facilitate recognition, would be strange indeed. Since, therefore, we know of no change which is to take place in the mind itself, which can affect recognition; and since the change which the body is to undergo seems far more likely to facilitate it than to operate against it, I hence conclude that no good reason as yet appears why we should not recognize our friends in heaven.

That all memory of the present will not be obliterated in the future life seems next thing to a universal faith at least amongst people conversant with the Bible. Indeed, is not this implied in the very fact of a future life? For if all memory of the present life is to be extinguished at death, then the future life will be to man not as a future life anteceded by this, but as a present life having no connection with a preceding one. Man is incapable of being rendered sensible that he ever existed as man

in a state before the present; that he there lived, acted, suffered, enjoyed, remembered as he here does. To him the present life is a first, an only life, because he has no memory or other link reaching back through this into another life, and connecting him therewith as identical in the two. By no power, faculty, capacity, or act of the soul, whether instantaneous or continuous, is man sensible of an existence prior to the present. Now, if all memory of the present life is to be extinguished at death, then in the future life man will be to the present life as he now is to a supposed previous life. The future life will then be to him a first, an only life; while the present one will be as a nonentity. I conclude then that the very phrase a future life implies a remembered connection with the present one; nay more, that it implies such a remembered connection as identifies the personal self of the present state with the same personal self of the future; and that this identity is a felt reality in the soul, which can no more be extinguished than can the soul itself. Now if all memory of the present life is not to be extinguished at death, what facts or parts of the remembered present are most likely to survive? Those facts or parts, we should conclude, which have most intensely excited the energies of the mind; which keep it longest in the highest state of activity; which it reproduces in memory most frequently and with the greatest facility; and around which cling the best and holiest passions of the human heart. And if amongst these is not to be reckoned the memory of kin and friends, it would be difficult to say what is to be reckoned. Indeed, the desire to remember and identify these in the future state is one of the most absorbing passions of the soul. It clings to this desire and to the faith that it will be gratified as it does to the love of existence or of personal identity. From this faith it refuses to part, neither will it question it any more than if it were one of the imperishable instincts with which kind Heaven had endowed it.

That man is to know himself as himself in heaven, is implied in the very fact of his personal identity. And not only will he know himself as himself, but he must possess the power to make himself known as himself. That he is to retain in his future state the power of intercommunication with his kind is involved in the fact that he is to exist there as man or as himself. Now in this intercommunication he must certainly possess the power to make himself known either as himself or as some one else. But if he possess only the power to make himself known as some one else, then the future will be a perpetual lie. This is inadmissible. I hence conclude that he must possess the power to make himself known as himself proper or in his true personal character. And

this power to make himself known to others as himself or in his true character, implies the power on their part to recognize him as himself or in his true character. For if they recognize him as another and not as himself, then their recognition is no recognition at all, but a standing lie. And this cannot be admitted. From all of which I again conclude that we shall know our friends in heaven.

Again, man is certainly either to know or not to know in the future. But we believe he shall know. For if he is not to know, then might he as well exist in the future state as a stone as exist as a man. Indeed in that event he would not be man at all. What else he would be we cannot say, but man he would not be. And not only do we believe that he shall know, but that he shall know truly; that is, know things as they really are, and not as they are not. Hence if he is to know his kind at all he is to know them truly; and therefore know those amongst them who are his friends as his friends, or recognize them.

If from the love of life and the desire of life, and the conscious and felt repugnance of all to annihilation, the immortality of the soul has been argued as in even the lowest degree probable, as it certainly has, then from the desire to know in the future, especially from the deep impassioned desire to know our friends, we may, it seems to me, legitimately argue the probability in some degree that we shall know them. This desire depends not on our dwelling in a body of flesh as the condition of its existence; at least we have no reason so to conclude, but on the very nature of the soul itself; and if so, then that it will in the future be gratified seems to be a necessary conclusion. It would be strange indeed if the beneficent Creator had built the soul of man and filled it with holy desires and instincts and then left it to be tantalized by these through eternity without ever having them gratified. I cannot think it. Not of course that the mere desire to meet and recognize friends in the future unconditionally guarantees the meeting of them, especially all of them; but that the desire would never have existed as a fact, had not provision been made to gratify it in a measure corresponding with its importance to man as a condition of his future happiness. This much the premises certainly warrant.

But after all the great and solid foundation on which the doctrine of a future recognition must rest is the Bible together with the nature of the memory itself. If these do not sustain the doctrine it must, in this life at least, be held to rest on very feeble grounds. Let it then be examined in the light of these its two chief supports. We shall give the precedence to the Bible, and hence collate its contents first. But before citing these seriatim

it may be well to ask in what general light the Bible seems to view the question, or how the two stand connected?

Certainly the Bible, as previously said, no where formally raises the question of a future recognition, neither consequently does it any where formally answer it. And is not this circumstance, it may be asked, rather against the doctrine than in favor of it? We think it at least not against it. The Bible seems clearly to take the doctrine for granted. It appears to be one of those quiet assumptions on which it proceeds as a thing in no sense doubtful, and hence never to be brought formally forward for decision. It underlies many of the sayings of the Bible, not as a hypothesis, but as a fact perfectly known to and admitted by the sacred penmen. Circumstances therein found imply it, expressions imply it—all so clearly that they seem to necessitate the admission of it. And while perhaps from no one of these circumstances or expressions singly, could the doctrine be evolved as a reality, incapable of being brought into question; yet from the whole of them together it seems susceptible of being deduced as a thing falling only a very little below, if below at all, an indisputable reality. We shall now proceed to cite and examine some of these Scriptures with the view of seeing how far they lend their sanction to the doctrine in hand.

1. "And he (the malefactor), said to Jesus, Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom. And Jesus said to him, verily, I say to thee, to-day shalt thou be with me in paradise." Luke xxiii: 42-43.

We stop not here to raise the question as to what paradise is or where it is. It is enough for us to know that it is the abode into which Jesus and the poor man who died with him entered immediately after death, there to remain, the greater till the third morning after his death, the less till this mortal puts on immortality—the abode perhaps in which dwell the spirits of all the just until they enter their spiritual bodies at the resurrection.

But what implies the language, *to-day shalt thou be with me in paradise?* Clearly that the person addressed, the spiritual personal *thou*, the essential self, the knowing entity entire, with all his faculties in full vigor, should that day be with Jesus in paradise. *Thou shalt be* asserts and guarantees the fact of a future, personal, intelligent existence; *with me*, the fact of future, conscious company with Jesus; and *in paradise*, the fact of a really to be known future abode; and all these not as absolute facts, but as relative—facts to be known to and realized in the experience of the personal thou addressed. To admit that the language implies less than this, would be, it seems to me, to make it a mockery. And if the language implies this, then follows as in a

high degree probable the fact of a future recognition. For then the *thou* addressed, remaining the same unchanged personal intelligence, was to pass from this state into another, still the *thou* and there to be with Jesus. This state was to be to the *thou* paradise, known as such, felt as such, realized as such. For if to the *thou* this place was not paradise but another place, then to the *thou* the promise of Jesus was a delusion. And this place could not be to the *thou* paradise without its tenantry of spirits. These must be met and known by the *thou* as the dwellers in the place; and if known, known in their true character, known as individuals, known as once of the present earth-state, and where here known, known there or *recognized*. All this the language and the fact it expresses seem necessarily to imply. Let us for a moment suppose that the personal *thou* addressed by Jesus ceased at death to be the same personal *thou* addressed, and became another *thou* or something else; then the personal *thou* addressed by him was not with him in paradise, but the other *thou* or the something else. His promise then in the fair and natural construction of it failed. But this cannot be admitted. I hence conclude that the identical *thou* addressed by Jesus passed with him into paradise—passed not merely with all his faculties of knowledge but with his knowledge itself; and that consequently where a person was there met who had been in that knowledge in this life, that such person, being still in that knowledge, *was recognized*. For if still in that knowledge non-recognition was impossible, and recognition a necessity.

II. "In my Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so I would have told you: I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you to myself, that where I am, there ye may be also." John xiv: 2-3.

Such is the language of the Saviour to his disciples just before his departure hence. How does it bear on the question in hand? "*I go to prepare a place for you.*" This *place*, this mansion in the Father's house, is a reality, a positive existent reality—a place in which the disciples were one day to dwell, *and which they were to recognize as the place promised them by the Saviour*. But how could they recognize that place as the place thus promised them *unless they bore with them the memory that it had been promised them*? The answer is, they could not do it at all. And if they bore with them the memory that it had been promised them, then the memory of the present; and if the memory of the present, then surely the memory of present friends; and if the memory of present friends, and these friends themselves went with them to that place, then certainly they recognized them. For if they

could recognize the place to which they went, as the place promised them by Jesus—a place which at the time of the promise they had not seen, and of which they knew nothing; how much more likely is it that they recognized the friends whom, at the same time, they perfectly knew, and which same friends they afterwards met in that place? The recognition of the place necessitates the admission of the recognition of the friends met in it. Should it be denied, however, that the disciples really recognized the place as the place promised them by Jesus, then his promise, so far as it relates to place, meant nothing; and might have been equally complied with by taking the disciples to one place just as well as another. This cannot be accepted.

“I will come again, and receive you to myself, that where I am, there ye may be also.” Now when the disciples shall be where Christ now is, when they shall be with him in the place here alluded to, will they not recognize him as the person promising the place? Surely they will. But this they cannot do without remembering both the promise and themselves as the persons to whom it was made. And not only must they remember both these; but the memory must reach back from the moment of the recognition to the moment when the promise was made; it must be felt to be continuous from the one of these points to the other. Nay more, not only must the memory be felt to be one, to be the same and continuous—its contents likewise must be felt to be the same. But among these contents, in the case of each disciple, are his fellow disciples as joint promisees with himself at the time when the promise was made, and that too as truly as is Christ amongst these contents. But these disciples could not be amongst these contents without being recognized. And if these are recognized, then also must others be; and hence would result the conclusion of a general recognition.

III. “And after six days, Jesus taketh Peter, James, and John his brother, and bringeth them up into an high mountain apart, and was transfigured before them, and his face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light. And behold, there appeared to them Moses, and Elias, talking with him.” Luke xvii: 1-3.

Here Moses and Elias actually reappeared on earth—appeared to Peter, James, and John. They appeared not as spirits, but as men, talking as men; and further they still wore their ancient well known names. Now since they appeared as themselves, must they not still have remembered themselves as themselves or as the prophets whose names they bore? Further, must they not have recognized the land of Judea, and the hill on which they stood? And must not their memory, perfect as it then was, have reached

back from that moment to the time when they had left these scenes at death? None but affirmative answers will satisfy these questions. Now, if they recognized the land to which they had returned, then much more must they have recognized the friends whom they had met between that moment and the moment of death. And if their memories remained faithful, and reached back through all intermediate time between the moment of reappearance and that of death, then, since in that memory friends were held whom they must have met in paradise, these friends I conclude must have been recognized. For if these were remembered as friends, but met as not friends, that is, as not old acquaintances, then may Moses and Elias who met them, have met them not as Moses and Elias but as other persons; and if when they so met them they met them truly, then when they reappeared, they may not have been Moses and Elias but the others, and this would contradict the word of God. View these circumstances, therefore, as we may, they seem to compel the admission of intermediate recognition. But suppose that Moses and Elias at the moment of reappearance had actually no memory reaching back through the past to death, how then could they know themselves as the ancient prophets whose names they bore? The thing was impossible. And if they could not so know themselves, then they could not be so represented; and yet so the narrative represents them. I conclude, then, that they knew or remembered themselves truly as Moses and Elias; and if so, the remembrance and recognition of others are implied. For how could they remember themselves as themselves except as in connection with the scenes through which they had passed, and the persons with whom they had acted in this life? Memory implies not only its object, but the relations of its object. Hence, if they remembered themselves as the prophets of a former age, they must also have remembered the persons with whom they then acted or to whom they stood related as parents or children or both; and if they still remembered these, and these were then present with them in paradise, recognition of them seems simply certain. Can I distinctly and perfectly remember the friend whom I met on yesterday, and can that friend be now present before me and I not recognize him? Hardly it seems to me without such a change in him as must deeply affect the question of his personal identity, if not to himself certainly to me. And if personal identity is to be realized as a fact only as to myself; in other words, if I am to be remembered as myself only by myself, and not to be remembered by others as myself, then the question of personal identity becomes one of little value, at least to me.

1V. "And I say to you, that many shall come from the east

and west, and shall set down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven." Matt. viii: 11.

That many of those who are to come from the east and west, and who are to set down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in the future kingdom, never knew them in this life needs no proof. Now one of two things is certain—either that they are to know them there as Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, or they are not. Certain it is that they are to set down with them, and hence to know them in some character. But if they are not to know them as Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, then are they to know them as not Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; that is, they are to know them falsely and not truly. This is inconsistent with the perfect truthfulness of the future state. And if they are to know Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob truly, whom in this life they never knew, how much more shall they know those whom in this life they perfectly knew. I hence, especially, conclude that those who in this life knew Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and who shall meet them in the future kingdom, will there know them or recognize them. And if they shall know *their* friends, then will others know *theirs*, and hence a general recognition.

V. "Then shall the righteous answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungered, and fed thee? or thirsty, and gave thee drink? when saw we thee a stranger, and took thee in? or naked, and clothed thee? or when saw we thee sick, or in prison, and came unto thee? And the king shall answer, and say to them, verily I say to you, inasmuch as ye have done it to one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it to me." Matt. xxv: 37-40.

This language is the representation of what is to occur in the future state. It relates to the time to which the question in hand relates; and deserves minute attention both for what it says and what it implies. 1. It details an actual personal interview in the future between Christ and certain of his disciples. This implies that such interviews will there take place. 2. This interview relates to acts of the present life, and assumes that these acts are still remembered. "Lord, when saw we thee hungry, thirsty, etc." This they had actually not seen, save in the qualified sense of the Saviour, and hence did not remember it; but their question implies that had they seen it they would have remembered it. There is no meaning in the question, "when saw we thee, &c.," except on the supposition that among the contents of a memory reaching back to the present life, the item named in the question was not recognized. 3. These acts stood related to persons as once living and suffering in the present life, and could be remembered only in connection with the persons to whom they related. 4.

These same persons were present in the place, and at the time of the interview. Now that the disciples with whom the interview was held could remember acts of the present life and those to whom the acts related; that those to whom the acts related could be present with the disciples at the interview; and yet the disciples not recognize them, would be marvelous—more marvelous certainly than the recognition. From this interview, therefore, I infer, as certain, the fact of a real future recognition.

VI. "Then he said, I pray thee therefore, father, that thou wouldest send him to my father's house: for I have five brothers, that he may testify to them, lest they also come into this place of torment." Luke xvi: 27-28.

The present passage is a voice from beyond the grave—a voice full of deep awful significance. It is specially in point, and specially instructive. It warrants the most pertinent inferences, and yet leaves no room for inference as to the truth of the question in issue. Here we have the fact fully brought out, and fully avouched of actual, future, conscious, personal existence. The rich man was conscious of himself as himself, remembered himself as the brother of five other brothers still alive in the present world, remembered the impenitence which had fixed his fate in hell; and that this would bring his brothers there unless they changed. Further, he wished his brothers warned against the place; believed that if warned by one from the dead, they would repent, and thus avoid it. All of which goes to establish that his intellectual powers were then not only perfect, but in the highest state of activity; that his perception of the dependence of future peace and happiness on the performance of duty was keen and just; in a word, that he was himself—himself in the highest sense of the term. Now that his brothers, if they followed him one after another into that place, remained each as perfect as he, need not be argued. If therefore, he as himself retained there all his powers of memory perfect, and there met his brothers, that he recognized them seems as a fact to be as certain as the fact of recognition in this life, because dependent, if not on the same, on like conditions. And if the fact of recognition here cannot be denied, neither, it seems to me, can it there be. Further, this man existed in hell not merely as a man with all his powers of mind perfect, but he existed there *as a brother*. The relations of this life remained the relations of that; or rather, the relations of this life underwent no change by the related party passing into that. Now as a relation implies its object, so the remembrance of the relation implies the remembrance of its object. Hence if the rich man's brothers are now in hell with him, as he there remembers them as brothers, he must there meet them as

brothers. But this is recognition. And if recognition is a fact in hell, equally is it a fact in heaven. Hence the inference that it is true.

But the fact of future recognition is not left to rest on merely inferential grounds. It is asserted as a fact. *The rich man actually recognized Lazarus.* They had met on earth at the gate of the former, the one rich the other a beggar. Their acquaintance had been brief, and possibly not pleasant; at least it is not likely that it was intimate. They were now in view of each other in the unseen. The rich man recognized the poor—this in paradise, that in torment—still he recognized him. And if on a brief acquaintance and now separated, the one recognized the other, how much more would they have recognized one another had they met as friends indeed, and both in paradise?

But the passage in hand warrants even more than this. Abraham recognized Lazarus—this it warrants. Any other conclusion is wholly inconsistent with the manner in which Abraham speaks of him. He speaks of his past life, speaks of his present, of his lot in that, his lot in this—speaks of both him and his life as matters with which he was then perfectly and even minutely familiar. But this he could not do without a knowledge which implies recognition. Besides, it must be remembered that at the time of the speaking Abraham and Lazarus were in the presence of each other. And further, since the rich man recognized Abraham, Abraham must have recognized the rich man; and if Abraham recognized the rich man across that deep gulf which was fixed between them, how much more must he have recognized Lazarus who was in his very bosom? This, then, is a case of actual future recognition. Hence the doctrine of future recognition is true.

But as an offset to all this it will be said that the case of the rich man and Lazarus is imaginary; that it is a parable; at least, that it is not a recital of actual facts; and, therefore, does not warrant the conclusion we deduce from it. Before any weight can be allowed to this offset it must be first shown that the case of the rich man and Lazarus is imaginary, or that it is a parable. Of the truth of this we have no evidence. Neither shall we allow it to be assumed. Especially shall we not allow it to be assumed, and an offset to be based on it not as on an assumption but as on a fact. Even allowing what we certainly do not allow, namely, that the case is a parable, still the parable must have its counterpart or basis in truth. If in the future state there be no intercourse involving recognition, it would be difficult to defend the Saviour's recital against the charge of being fabulous.

We have now cited and examined six passages of Scripture. The number might be greatly extended without, it may be, any

material advantage to the final result. We shall let these suffice; and leave the candid reader to decide whether we have made a legitimate use of them or not. If we have not abused them, but dealt with them fairly, then that the doctrine of a future recognition is impliedly taught in them seems indisputable. We now therefore proceed to examine the memory, its nature, and facts, to see what light these shed on the curious question in hand.

By memory is meant the power of the mind to retain the impressions made on it. Whether it shall be called a capacity or a faculty is not here deemed important; neither is it necessary to raise the question, whether in an act of retention the mind is active or passive. These are questions for the metaphysician, in no sense material here. The general term impressions is used to denote every form and degree of knowledge we possess, as well as the whole cabinet of facts collected by the sentient being.

One thing is here taken for granted, namely: that if all the impressions of the present life are faithfully conserved to the next, and these accurately and vividly reproduced, recognition of our friends is certain. Sameness of person and fidelity of memory are unquestionably the conditions of recognition. Now that we shall remain the same persons in the future life cannot be denied. The doctrine of future rewards and punishments would be false on any other hypothesis. Indeed, the whole Bible would be false. Will all the impressions of the present life, then, be faithfully retained in memory to the next? We firmly believe they will.

That innumerable impressions are made on the mind in the present life, which after awhile seldom, and in many instances never, reappear, is a simple fact well-known in the experience of every one. Do these disappearing impressions perish forever? When once they seem to be permanently out of sight has the memory lost them completely never to recall them again? It would be melancholy indeed to think that it has. The soul turns from the thought much as it does from that of annihilation. Still may it not be true? If so, then certainly may the friends of the present life vanish one after another from the spirit's view till all are gone never to be remembered more. But if on the other hand these impressions do not wholly perish; if they are not blotted forever, but still truly exist in the memory, only in a form so obscure or in a state so latent as not to be noticeable, then may they under new and special conditions reappear again; and thus the whole contents of the memory be reproduced in the future. Should this be the case we shall then have the only remaining condition essential to the most perfect recognition. Again, then, we ask, will the memory faithfully retain all the

impressions of the present, and accurately reproduce them in the future? On the answer to this hangs the whole question so far as its solution is determined by memory.

Absolute certainty in the premises is perhaps not attainable. All we have the right to demand is an answer of which we can say, upon the whole, it is more likely to be true than to be false. This attained and we should rest content; for this joined with the conclusions which we have now seen to be warranted by holy writ, and the doctrine in issue rises high over a mere probability. Indeed if there be no collision between those conclusions and the facts of memory, then may we well afford to accept the doctrine as a fact. Future recognition we may then feel to be certain.

Do the contents of memory, or the impressions made on it, or any portion of them, ever wholly perish? Long and acutely has the question been discussed. It is not here proposed to move the discussion afresh. Thereby we should be led deep, very deep, into the subtleties and intricacies of metaphysics, which it is the intention of this piece to avoid. It may be fairly set down as the settled faith of mankind, especially of the great masters of thought, *that the contents of the memory are indestructible*—that, (to present a strong case) though an impression may have been completely out of sight for three score years and ten, still it is as really and as truly in the mind as though it had never disappeared for a moment. An impression, in this view, may be compared to a pebble on the sea shore. Both are at present in full view. That pebble is dropped into the sea. Instantly it is lost to sight, yet it is not wholly lost; for it still sleeps in some inaccessible cavern of the deep. So with the impression. For awhile it is distinctly remembered, but gradually vanishes. Yet it is not lost; only it is not reproduced. It still exists in the mind as really as at the moment when first made, but the requisite conditions to reproduction not continuing to co-exist with it, it does not reappear. "All the cognitions which we possess," says an author cited by Hamilton, "or have possessed, still remain to us—the whole complement of all our knowledge still lies in our memory; but as new acquisitions are continually pressing in upon the old, and continually taking place along with them among the modifications of the ego, the old cognitions, unless from time to time refreshed and brought forward, are driven back, and become gradually fainter and more obscure. This obscuration is not, however, to be conceived as an obliteration, or as a total annihilation." And this is the voice not of a single witness, but the voice of many. So far then as the indestructibility of the contents of memory can derive any support from witnesses, the most competent to speak in the case, it has all the support necessary to entitle it to the highest confidence.

Many are the facts of memory which tend to establish that its contents are indestructible. An impression is made upon the mind but soon forgotten. Now this impression is to us as a non-entity. Of it we are wholly unconscious. We neither think of it nor try to think of it. Amongst all the appreciable phenomena of the mind it at least does not appear. Had it never been made it could not be for us more completely non-existent than it seems to be. Yet after the lapse, it may be, of ten, twenty, or even fifty years, at the mention of a name, or the sight of some spot, as a house, a field, a stream, a tree, or a turn in the road, that impression reappears, and is as fresh and distinct as though made only a moment ago. And why should not this be true of all forgotten impressions? They are not annihilated; and therefore only want, in order to enable them to reappear, the presence of some condition which shall excite the reproductive energies of the mind. This condition present, and the impression must reappear.

Again, how often is it the case that impressions seem to have perished forever, and, indeed, for aught the mind itself is conscious of or can avouch, they have perished forever; and yet on the mind's becoming excited by disease, or disturbed by a blow, or by some other cause which unsettles a state of present quiescence or revives one of former activity, they suddenly reappear, and remain during the presence of the exciting cause, and then, when the normal state is restored, again disappear? Instances of this sort are innumerable, and some of them certainly very curious. Words of an unknown language have been heard, for instance, which the person hearing was wholly unable to repeat two minutes afterwards, and yet this same person on being attacked with fever, repeated them as though a part of her own vernacular. This goes far to prove that an impression once made upon the mind, no matter how slightly or how little taken notice of at the time, is never wholly lost; and therefore that the memory of friends is never obliterated. But, it may be asked, will the conditions necessary to reproduction be certainly present in the future state? If not, why has the Creator, who does nothing in vain, made provision through the mental mechanism to have these impressions retained? If they are not to reappear, why did he not appoint that when once they are out of sight, they should be extinct forever? In this life man has use for these impressions, hence they are preserved; and since they are preserved even when they seem to be out of mind, I thence conclude that we shall have use for them in future; and if so, then will they reappear.

But will the reappearance of these impressions in the future life

depend on any conditions extrinsic to the mind itself? We have certainly no right so to think. In life we know that their reappearance frequently depends on such conditions. But we cannot affirm this of the future life. Indeed there are facts of the present life which go far to show that these reappearances will not depend on conditions extrinsic to the mind itself. Of these I shall mention the one which I deem the most pertinent.

Persons have fallen into the water, and afterwards been taken out, as was supposed, dead. On recovering they relate that in the moment when death, as they conjecture, was about to ensue, instantly the whole history of life flashed into view or was reproduced in memory; that not a single impression of all the thousands that had been traced on it was omitted; and that of this last fact the mind was rendered most vividly conscious. Instances of what is here said are numerous and well authenticated. Now in these cases reappearance seems to depend on no fact out of the mind itself. It seems to depend on nothing except the partial emancipation of the soul from the body—an event which can be conceived as affecting the mind in no other way than as freeing it from all conditions, and thereby leaving it to reproduce its impressions of memory simply as mind or unconditionally. If this be true, then the conclusion that the mind will reproduce all the impressions of the present life faithfully in the future life, becomes not only certain but an absolute necessity. For whatever the mind does as mind or unconditionally, it does necessarily. And if the mind faithfully reproduces in the future life, the impressions of the present, then must it reproduce the impression of the friends of the present; and if the impression of these is reproduced in heaven, and the friends themselves are there, then shall we recognize them. Here, therefore, for the present, we must rest the investigation of the subject. The limits of this paper have already been extended beyond what we intended when we set down to write. Still we must crave the indulgence of the reader long enough to notice a few objections which may possibly be urged against the doctrine we have been defending.

How, it may be asked, can one spirit recognize another in paradise when both are formless, and therefore featureless things? Now if the spirit of man is without form, and therefore without features, as is here assumed, and if recognition hereafter shall depend on form and features, then certainly must future recognition be impossible. But is this really so? Is the spirit thus formless and featureless? I at least do not believe it. The whole thing is a vulgar myth. Let him, therefore, who affirms it make it good; otherwise we are at perfect liberty to reject it. The

spirit of man is a person, a real person, having its own peculiar nature, distinguishable from the other natures and things about it, and therefore cognizable, and if cognizable then recognizable. That either God or the spirit of man is formless and featureless is profoundly absurd. The very instincts of the soul recoil from the sentiment. The thought has crept into the world through infamous creeds, and now, like a foul spirit, refuses to be exorcised save by almighty power. The idea that God is an inane thing, as formless as the air we breathe, and hence, for aught I can see, capable of being mistaken for it or confounded with it, is the essence of folly. Neither is this true of the spirit of man. On the contrary, spirit is to spirit out of the body, as man to man in the body—that is, a palpable, visible, real person, known and to be known by one another in the next life only more perfectly than we are in this. Such at least is my faith.

But says another objection, if we recognize our friends in heaven, then shall we miss those that are not there, and this will render us forever unhappy. Now I fully believe we shall miss our absent kin and friends; and yet I just as fully believe that we shall be perfectly happy. How this can be, or how these two things can be made to consist together, is something I have no means of explaining. Still I shall certainly not reject it on that account. We shall miss our absent kin in heaven. This at present is a very painful thought. Let us then labor the more assiduously for their salvation in this life. Then shall we not be pained by missing them in the next. But let me put the matter in another form to the reader. You tell me, if you miss your kin in heaven, it will give you pain. How now do you propose to avoid this pain? Will you accept the notion of non-recognition? You cannot know the friends whom you shall meet in heaven, without missing those that are absent. Are you willing to be deprived of the pleasure of knowing those, in order to avoid the pain, if pain it shall be, of missing these? Hardly I think.

When we reach the presence of God, should this be our happy lot, our pleasure must spring, in a large measure, from our perfect knowledge that he does all things well. We shall then know that the absence of our kin is just. Hence if their absence in itself can give us no pleasure, and I see not that it can, at least its justness will cause us no pain. We may therefore rest assured that if it does not augment our joy, it will certainly not diminish our happiness. But of these matters we are not, perhaps, in our present state, with our imperfect knowledge, in a condition to speak. For the present, then, let us rest content. When we no longer see through a glass darkly all will be right.

Finally, from all the premises now before us I conclude that th

e

recognition of our friends in heaven—their *full and perfect recognition*, is something we may profoundly believe. Of the truth of this not a doubt hangs in my soul. Let us then work on, work ever, that we may increase the number whom we shall meet there. May God make you, gentle reader, one of that number.

A COMMENTARY ON ACTS OF APOSTLES.

SUCH is the title of a work just issued from the press by Brother J. W. McGARVEY. To say that the work is creditable to its patient and laborious author, would be a poor compliment indeed. It is a high honor to him. Throughout it bears most obvious traces of fine ability; clear, calm, close thought, and unremitting application. It is not too critical to be eminently useful to the common reader, nor too popular in its style to be richly entertaining to the scholar. It is admirably adapted to both. We are positively thankful for the work, and have high pleasure in commending it to our brotherhood. It is the first book of the kind ever offered to the public by any one of our brethren; and we have no hesitation in pronouncing it the soundest work on the subject of which it treats now in print. Its soundness is its chief praise, and this is always high praise. We want our brethren to purchase, own, and distribute ten thousand copies of the work at once. Our cause demands this, and the merits of the work demand it.

The author has selected Acts of Apostles as the field for his critical and literary labors. We hope he will make it the field of his life-long toil. This book we want Brother McGarvey to make the book of his life. We want him to review it, re-write it, re-think it, and improve it, until nothing shall be left to be done in this particular department. We want him to make it not merely respectable, but masterly—a grand final work. Such a work will be an imperishable monument to himself, and invaluable to the world. We hope the brotherhood will so liberally and cordially encourage the work that in a few years its author will feel called upon to give us a splended new edition of it—on fine paper, large type, and in the most facinating style.

But now that the work of Commenting has commenced among us, who will be the next to furnish us a similar work? Let each man select his book in the New Testament, and on this bestow the labor of his life. No other course can prove so eminently successful. The Lord willing, before many years we have a word to say on the Letter to the Saints in Rome. Will not Bro. Pendleton, Bro. Loos, Bro. Proctor, *et al.*, join us in the same grand work? We hope for a hearty *yes*.

REPLY TO AN ARTICLE ENTITLED "DO THE UNIMMERSED COMMUNE?"

THE importance this subject begins to assume among our brethren arises not from any speculative value that may be thought to reside in the question itself, but from the practical influence its decision is to have over the conduct of our churches toward other professors of religion. The inquiry, should we commune with pious unimmersed persons of other churches? can neither be ignored as useless, nor settled without discussion. This is our apology for pushing the investigation a little further in the present number of the Quarterly.

The three grand postulates laid down on the second page of the article under consideration will be fully admitted by every one well instructed in the kingdom of God; nor do we base the strength of our reply on any supposed ability to discount the value of these positions. The substance of these postulates is, that no man can enter the church or kingdom on earth without a birth of water and Spirit; that the Lord's Supper is an institution belonging wholly to the church, and therefore, that none but the immersed were ever contemplated in the Scriptures as communicants at the Lord's table. That these are Bible truths is wholly unassailable, the command being to preach them fully and to bring all the honest hearted to their full appreciation and acceptance.

Notwithstanding this full admission of the postulates it may still be a legitimate inquiry, *whether God ever makes allowance for the unfortunate circumstances of some good men so as to admit them into his church with anything less than a perfect understanding, and a perfect obedience to these established conditions of salvation.* It must be admitted that many pious people have studied the Bible most of their lives without ever having arrived at the particular truths eliminated by brother Campbell and others a few years ago—men who would have rejoiced to be immersed had they known it would please God—whom, as our author says, "God accepts as his, because they would be Christians had they the chance"—men whom God saves "because they do the best they can in the circumstances which surround them." For these I intercede, and claim for them a place in the church of Christ in spite of their intellectual mistakes. The heady sectarian, the indifferent sinner, and the self-willed bigot may stand in the court of final appeals without counsel from me; I appear not in their defense.

Before proceeding to the discussion of this subject, the reader will permit me to place a caveat in sight of all. In pleading intensely for any single truth is it not possible even for a good man so to concentrate all his thoughts on a single point as to disqualify him for giving due weight to any other consideration that would tend to modify his views? May he not, for example, so focalize all his thoughts on John iii: 5, as to deprive other passages of due attention? This passage, with some, stands out as an inexorable law, an iron rule that God himself can scarcely manage even when the circumstances seem to demand it. Does the Almighty become the slave of his own law? Admitting he has never explicitly promised to modify that condition of salvation even when men "do the best they can," still the inquiry before us is a legitimate one. We are not to argue whether it is right and necessary to preach the doctrine of John iii: 5, nor will it be necessary for any valorous knight-errant, booted and spurred, and punoplied, to charge on his favorite Rosinante, around this passage and swear by all the gods to defend it, as he would his lady-love, from all insults whatever, for no attack is to be made upon that important Scripture; the only question being whether, *according to Scripture*, every soul is absolutely and unalterably shut out of the kingdom who has not been immersed, regardless of all palliating circumstances. Let us then calmly approach the investigation.

I. In sustaining the negative to the above inquiry, we no more disturb the gospel arrangements for salvation than the gifted author of the article we are reviewing has done to sustain the affirmative. The sum of all that is taught in said article, may be briefly comprehended in this, that while God has established certain regular conditions of entrance both into heaven and the church, the conditions of entering heaven may be, and doubtless will be relaxed, as in the case of Luther, but that the conditions of entering the church can no more be modified than the laws of the Medes and Persians. I hope I do not misrepresent the learned brother. If I misrepresent him in any respect it must be in saying that he teaches certain definite conditions of getting to heaven, and that these conditions are sometimes modified in favor of such men as Luther, because of their unfavorable circumstances. And yet I cannot think that even this misstates his views. He will surely admit that the way into heaven, like that into the church, is not only plain but well defined. "Blessed are they that *do his commandments* for they shall have a right to the tree of life, and shall enter in through the gates into the city." It is he that "does the will of the Father in heaven" that shall enter the kingdom.

Luther never was immersed, and according to our brother, never did commune; and yet he got to heaven. He never did the will of God so far as to enter the kingdom on earth, and yet the writer "does not deny that God took him when he died." Did not the Lord then suspend the operation of the established laws, the normal conditions of getting to heaven, in this case? These conditions are to come into Christ, to live in Christ, and to die in Christ. If Luther was not in the kingdom, he certainly failed in all these conditions, unless he came into Christ without coming into the kingdom. Still he found some way into heaven without baptism, without the kingdom, without communion, without becoming a Christian, without "doing his commandments." Now if after all these failures Luther still reached the heavens, it must be that God relaxed the rigor of the *conditions* on account of the adverse "circumstances which the Reformer could not control." God must have seen that he would have done right in all these particulars "if he had had a chance"—made allowance for the unavoidable mistakes of his head, and accepted the intentions of his heart. To all this I have no objections. We agree that it was right he should be saved in the absence of correct views of baptism.

Should we now affirm that the same considerations that excused Luther at the gate of heaven, and admitted him in the absence of some of the fixed conditions, may also have excused him at the door of the church, and may have admitted him in absence of some of the regular conditions of initiation there, who could invalidate the reasoning? Does the gate of heaven swing open more carelessly than that of the church? What an enormous compromise of the conditions of final salvation must be made to accept such a man in heaven! Would his admission into the church in default of the single act of immersion be a compromise of truth half so great as to admit him to the right hand of God when with the Bible in his hand he missed the church in all its length, breadth, and importance? It will not be questioned that the road to heaven is through the church—*through the holy place into the most holy*. There is as little Scripture to point out any other way to heaven, as there is to show how a man may enter the church without immersion. If the Holy One can make allowance for the circumstances of men so far as to admit them to the honors of his immediate presence, despite their ignorance and failures in duty, why may he not manage the case for a pious prayerful soul seeking the kingdom below, even if he has not learned the duty of immersion? The strange plan of having a God-fearing, God-loving man to walk all along through life just outside the holy place, and then enter the most holy, by a kind

of side-door, is certainly a new invention, deserving a patent. The church in such cases is not an indispensable—not necessary for Luther “to enter in by the door into the fold”—the holy place, the candlestick, the shew bread, and altar of incense may all be left to one side, and the Lord must cut a new door through the ram skins, and badger skins, and gold-covered plank, to get this outside traveler into the most holy. ‘This is a poor compliment to the church, which is the real way to heaven, and which doubtless does conduct every soul, responsible for gospel light, that ever will see God. If Luther is now in the holy place above, it is because he was in the church below; if he was in the church he was a Christian, and if a Christian he could commune, and did commune.

II. Having shown, I think, that the essayist in attempting to escape one difficulty, has fallen into several others, I proceed to present other considerations which seem to invite a reconsideration of his views.

1. If Luther was not immersed he never did, according to the view I am opposing, obtain remission of sins. Immersion being as much a condition of remission as of entering the kingdom, the logic that would hinder the latter would also forbid the former. Pardon without immersion! If this were possible perhaps one could enter the kingdom without immersion, for it is alike the antecedent of both. Although the writer has not expressed an opinion as to Luther’s forgiveness, we may safely infer he does not believe the old Reformer ever was pardoned on earth—certainly not till toward the close of his life, or about the time of his death, just so as not to take any sin with him into heaven. If this be not the position assumed, and Luther is allowed to have been pardoned at all before his dying hour, it must have been without immersion. He was pardoned before his death, or at his death, or after he got to heaven, or never. If he is in heaven at all, he is there either with his sins or without them; the former position will not be assumed—how then did he obtain remission? The only rational answer is that the heavenly Father, seeing his good intentions and great efforts to serve him, passed over his intellectual mistakes, admitted him into his kingdom here, and took him *through the church* into heaven; all of which would be more consistently done than to raise a sinner unforgiven to the heavenly kingdom.

2. Such a man being neither pardoned nor in the kingdom, he surely did not enjoy the Holy Spirit. The Spirit does not inhabit an unclean sinful soul. If he does dwell with any outside the kingdom the chapter and verse should doubtless be named. Now nothing is plainer than that those “not having the Spirit” shall

never see the Lord.—Jude 19. As God is to quicken the saints' mortal bodies by the Spirit that dwells in them, Luther not having that Spirit cannot attain to the first resurrection. Those who are accounted worthy to obtain that world are all "sealed as servants of God."—Rev. vii. If Luther was not in the kingdom for want of immersion, or for any other cause, he could have attained neither to the pardon of sins nor to the Holy Spirit, nor to any of its fruits, as these are blessings found within and not without the kingdom. That an unforgiven sinner could enjoy all these spiritual blessings outside the church, would be rather a dangerous doctrine to preach—"blessed with all spiritual blessings in Christ"—not *out of* Christ. I had always considered church-membership in a gospel land a *sine qua non* in the way to heaven—not *one* of the ways, but *the way*—there being no private path outside the walls of Zion leading to heaven. If the Lord entertains so unalterable a regard for the established forms of entering the church below, it seems strange that he would virtually abandon all regard for the proper manner of entering his church above, and that at a ten-fold greater sacrifice of truth—straining out the gnat and swallowing the camel. And all this is true unless it can be proved that the single act of immersion outweighs the remission of sins, the gift of the Spirit, church-membership, a clean heart, and all the fruits of the Spirit. Why choose the harder part? It is agreed on all sides, that Luther was "taken to heaven when he died;" it remains therefore as indisputable truth that he was in the kingdom on earth, was pardoned, received the Spirit and was a Christian—the same logic that apologizes for his not having entered heaven according to established order being quite sufficient to apologize for his not having entered the church in a perfect way.

3. What proof have we in the Scriptures that any but *Christians* will enter that rest? those who have left Egypt, crossed the wilderness and the Jordon? This remark does not include infants, idiots, heathen, or any other soul that ought not to be judged by the New Testament, but those only who may become Christians. With this qualification all the world might be considered Christians or sinners. If no pious unimmersed person was ever born of God, where is the evidence that any one of them ever has been or ever will be saved? "The dead in Christ (Christians) are to rise first." "Blessed and holy is he (the Christian) that has part in the first resurrection." "Those who sleep in Jesus will God bring with him." Who else will he bring? Luther and all such will he bring provided they *sleep in Jesus*, into whom they must have come without immersion if at all. This ordinance, with some good people, seems inexorably to,

blockade the way into Christ, not even admitting the decent apology of unfortunate circumstances which is potent enough at the gate of heaven. With such persons immersion was not made for man, but man for immersion. The great Arbiter of all human affairs can make allowance for almost any intellectual blunder except a mistake in regard to this ordinance which is something like the sin against the Holy Ghost—never forgiven in this world even if it is in the next. The heart may glow with love like Baxter's, and the whole life be fragrant of heaven as John Howard's—no matter, it all goes for little, if this be wanting they are but sounding brass and tinkling cymbals. Now if Luther or any other pious sprinkled believer is ever saved it will be because they learned and obeyed as much of divine truth and duty as justified the Lord under all the circumstances, in admitting them into his kingdom here, and through this into heaven. This I prefer to believe until it is proved that those who are not Christians—so far from God that they never could commune—will ever be saved; or until it shall appear that truth upon the whole is compromised more by the view I submit than by the one I oppose. In the one case God accommodates his mercy to men over a failure as to a single ordinance, but in the other he must extend his mercy over many a failure unto justification in heaven. The thought that immersion is equal in importance to all that a man misses by not being a member of the church; that a failure in this would form as great an obstruction at the door of the church as a failure in the items of pardon, the Holy Spirit, &c., does at the door of heaven, reminds us of a passage in Lalla Rookh:

"Take all the pleasures of all the spheres,
And multiply each through endless years,
One moment of heaven is worth them all."

III. This leads to a brief discussion of a subject we do not feel fully able to handle, and shall not complain of a courteous dissent from the view submitted. In all that has been said of Luther, and such like, no *Scripture* authority has been cited, either by the essayist or his reviewer, to show that God will make any allowance for the unfortunate *circumstances* so often referred to. I now ask, *do the Scriptures teach that God will in any case, or for any cause, pass by the neglect or the violation of his law without bringing on the threatened penalty or withholding the intended blessing?* A few witnesses shall testify.

1. In Joshua, 5th chapter, it appears that although every male Jew, young and old, was circumcised when they left Egypt, this rite was altogether neglected for the space of forty years; and when all were safe over Jordon, Joshua circumcised them at the

command of the Lord. From the days of Abraham the Jews had circumcised their male children. The law declared that whatever male child was not circumcised when eight days old, should be cut off from among his people. For forty years this law was undeniably neglected, for which neglect the penalty certainly was not executed. The reasons that influenced the divine Mind in so winking at the sins of a people who were by no means ignorant of this law may not be very well understood, but that some reason existed, that justified his bending the law to the circumstances of the people, may be safely affirmed. I am aware it may be replied that baptism is an *organic* law, relating to the very creation of the Christian state, and that circumcision not being such could be more easily set aside. It should be remembered, however, that the upper kingdom has its organic laws also, viz: *a proper initiation into the kingdom below*—not attained to by Luther or any other unimmersed person, and that organic law is equally in the way in both cases. If our heavenly Father may have justifiable reasons for managing as he did in regard to circumcision, and sets aside the organic law of heaven to admit Luther there, it would be singular if he could not manage to admit him into the church.

2. When David was flying for life before Saul he came to Nob, to Ahimelech the priest, and being very hungry asked the priest for five loaves of bread. He was told there was no "common bread" there, nothing but "hallowed bread." "So the priest gave him the hallowed bread, for there was no bread there but shew bread." The Saviour, in Matt. xii, admits it to have been unlawful for David and his companions to eat this bread, and yet justifies the deed under the circumstances. The lesson taught is that the law was made for man, and not man for the law, and that whenever God sees that in certain peculiar conjunctions of things the law does not minister to man's good, he may with great propriety suspend the normal operation of that law.

3. "Or have ye not read in the law how that on the sabbath days the priests in the temple profane the sabbath and are blameless." Here is a telling sentence—even the priests, and that in the temple and on the sabbath, break that sabbath, and yet are *blameless*. What this profanation consisted in is not material to the present argument, it being quite sufficient to note that the Saviour recognized it as a profanation, and that with impunity. The last two circumstances were quoted by the Saviour in justification of another of the same kind—the disciples plucking ears of corn on the sabbath—showing that all these facts bear the same moral complexion and are alike opposed to the severe deductions of a merciless legalism. If a man may violate a *known* law, and be

blameless, how much the more blameless if the law be unknown as is the case with many with regard to immersion.

Here would follow an examination of the whole doctrine of the intentions as intimately allied to the last remarks, but we must be content with the statement of a few facts, in answer to the following query: *How does God regard those whose intention and effort it is to do his will, but who for any cause whatever fail literally to do his commandments?*

1. The true meaning of the parable of the vineyard in Mat. xx, is thought to lie in close proximity with the answer to this question. Those employed at the eleventh hour were paid a penny a day not as a matter of justice but of goodness. They could not *claim* a penny for their one hour's work, but the good master knew they had been in the market-place all day *wanting* work—their intention was good, and in spirit they had worked all day, and though not legally, yet morally they deserved as much as the others. God knows that many a good man would know his will early in life, and know it perfectly if he could, and would just as lief be immersed as sprinkled if he knew he desired it. The laborers failed to work for want of a chance; and hundreds fail to be immersed for want of a chance. My child believes all I teach it, right or wrong, and suspects every man who controverts my views. If I teach it sprinkling, it can scarcely be said to have an opportunity to know better. And why should any man's eye be evil because God is good enough to bless the unfortunate beyond the mere regulations of a law he has a right to suspend?

2. In Luke xii: 48, one is beaten with many stripes and one with few stripes. The cause of the difference made in their treatment is not found in the relative number or enormity of their sins, there being no difference in these so far as we are informed, but in the fact that one knew more than the other. This proves that God does not judge men by the "*hard* light of the Bible," but rather moves mere legality into the rear of his more favorite moral forces. He then that received "few stripes" escaped in part the exactions the law would have demanded had no moral considerations operated in his favor. This circumstance is not quoted to discount the force of the law in John iii: 5, but to show that God has a way of making allowance for those who do not know his will.

3. The ten lepers that were commanded to go and show themselves to the priests to be cured did not literally obey, for "it came to pass *as they went* they were healed"—healed without showing themselves to the priests. All we desire to prove by this is, that Jesus has here stereotyped the comforting truth that he is above all law—that though our duty ties us to the law, he does not tie himself to it, and that he sometimes takes,

the purpose of the heart instead of the deed. Abraham's purpose to slay Isaac is to the same effect.

The instances cited in this third paragraph refer to persons who not only intended to do right, but who knew what was right. There is another question that searches still farther into the deep things of God than any of the preceding, viz: *Will God credit any man for seriously and religiously doing as a command, that which he has not commanded?*

1. We discover in Rom. xiv: 14, that it is wrong for a man to do that which he thinks to be wrong, though the act in itself be innocent enough. If a weak brother, just converted from idolatry, considered it wrong to eat meat that had been offered to an idol, to him it would be wrong, notwithstanding "there is nothing unclean *in itself*." "But to him that *esteemeth* anything to be unclean *to him* it is unclean." Sin would attach to the soul by an act which in itself is not sinful. Sin it seems is generated not only by a transgression of the expressed law of God, but by a violation of the convictions of the soul of man, even when his convictions are wrong. Now if sin may be generated by violating the convictions of the soul where no law of God's word is broken, why may not virtue, which God will accept, be generated by following the impulses of a religious heart even where God has issued no command? This inquiry is fairly answered in Rom. xiv: 6. "He that regardeth the holy day, for which observance there was no existing law, regardeth it to the Lord." "He that eateth not to the Lord, he refrains from eating and giveth God thanks." He regards the day *to the Lord*. Paul thought the religious complexion of this deed a good thing. *To the Lord* he eateth not. This too seems to have been credited as good, for he giveth God thanks in it. God neither commanded the one, nor forbade the other, yet he recognized the good intention, in both cases, to serve him. According to the hard light of mere legality this struggle of a religious heart would all go for nothing, but according to the more gracious system of Christianity, which judges by the secrets of the heart, they are to be credited for what they try to do. It is only on this principle that the Saviour declared the widow's two mites were more than all the benefactions of the rich—it cost her a greater effort—she had more heart in the work than they. To apply the principle to those who innocently mistake sprinkling for baptism, why may not the same gracious eye look upon them with allowance because they intend to serve God in it—do it unto the Lord though not commanded? It is not intended to compare a New Testament ordinance with a Jewish holy day, but to discover a principle in moral government which may often be seen in the smallest circumstance as well as in the most important command.

2. God is our father and we are his children. And what man of you having a son whom you know to be tremblingly anxious to obey you, but who for some reason misapprehending your wishes does not obey as you meant, but with the consciousness of an honest heart, looks up into your face for an approving smile, would have the heart to frown him from your presence? Monstrous! I thank God that he has a father's heart.

3. Finally, the *end* of the whole system of religion is *love*. When a poor feeble sinner learns enough of Jesus to love him, and tries to express that love by doing something he deems the will of God, I cannot think he will coldly disregard his act merely because he erred in judgment. If so *who of us* will be saved? It is just as easy to be mistaken on the subject of baptism under adverse circumstances, as on many other religious questions. The truth is, baptism is undeniably on the way from the world into the church—it is no less on the way from the world to heaven. The church stands directly between the sinner and the heavenly kingdom. Whether any person, responsible for New Testament light, will ever see heaven without being a Christian, is more than doubtful. Neither Luther, nor Baxter, nor Newton, nor Brainerd, if not Christians, have ever seen the Lord. If saved they must have been in the kingdom here; must have been pardoned, sanctified by the Spirit; must have been *Christians*; must have loved, so had a right to commune, ~~could~~ ~~commune~~, and ~~did~~ commune.

I now close the discussion of this interesting theme by repeating that whatever God may do in cases where allowance ought to be made, our duty as Christian ministers is to preach constantly the whole truth, leaving the entire margin beyond that to the discretion of him who will judge the world in righteousness. The object of the present article is not to diminish aught from the value and the power of any command of God, but to cultivate a field of thought which heretofore may have been somewhat neglected. May the Lord enlarge our minds to see the whole truth in all its bearings upon poor humanity, and make us all still abler ministers of his holy word.

THETA.

THETA's Review is submitted to the readers of the Quarterly without comment for the present. Possibly it may yet be replied to, still it may not. From some of its positions and some of its reasonings we utterly dissent. The one we deem unsound, the other inconclusive. As a review, however, it is frank if not daring—the work of an old friend of clear head and kind heart, whose very frailties lean to mercy's side; and we ask for it a calm and thoughtful reading. The spirit of the piece is noble and faultless. Its charity we think licentious.

M. E. L.

MY FIRST MEETING.

My first meeting was held far, very far, out in the West, at a place called Oakland. The place was so named from the fine old oak beneath whose grand shade the meeting was held, and from the forest of puerile oaks that grew round it near and far, all of which, for aught I know to the contrary, may have been the true, lineal, and I will even say, legitimate, descendants of that same patriarchal tree, for it looked as if it might have been the sire of an endless breed of oaks. True these oaks were not all of the same species; for some were white and some were black, but what of that. We have white men and Hams all from the same human stock, and why not white oaks and black all from the same acorn? From the meeting to which I am now alluding, Oakland soon became somewhat famous in the circumjacent country, an honor which I am glad to inform the reader it has not forfeited even to this writing, and which I take uncommon pleasure in mentioning. Shortly after the meeting and close to Oakland, a little town sprang rapidly up called Haynesville. It was so named after Collet Haynes, a plain, honest farmer in the neighborhood, whose greatest sin was that he used to predict, in my young days, as I have been told, that I would most certainly at some time be hanged. And to confess plain truth there were conjunctures and mischances in my early days, from which one even far less skilled in wizzard arts than honest Collet might have prognosticated, with no large fear certainly of ever being convicted of lying, the happening of a similar or even worse event. Hitherto, I am thankful, Collet's vaticinations have not been realized, and I am struggling in prayer and living in hope that they never will. Haynesville I still remember with becoming gratitude; I remember it chiefly for its mean pies, honest men, virtuous women, muddy streets, and numerous tribes of dogs. It is no great town, to be sure, and properly enough has never made any very great pretensions to township. Yet Haynesville has its merit: it has never produced a politician nor a rhymester—two of the greatest calamities that can befall a village. The former seldom fails to corrupt the men, the latter to turn the women; and a village with its men corrupted, and women turned, is low, very low. Haynesville stands in the midst of a district of country of great fertility of soil—a district, which I am sorry to add, has ceased within the last few years to be very eminent for any thing. I doubt whether it can now boast so much as even a noble Durham or a full-bred Cuban hound. A long time ago, that

is to say, in the days of Solomon Kimzey, it used to be noted for its numerous Baptist and Methodist revivals, and for the innumerable ghosts that infested it. The former we have frequently attended; any of the latter we cannot confidently say we ever saw. The statement is made on the authority of Drew Cogdell, a bold hunter, a brave man, very apt to see ghosts, and sure to tell it when he did. But in those times the district had other merits than these. It contained the meanest clan of Smiths that ever disgraced that name. Should one of them ever be saved, and we pray that many of them may, their song will be—

Amazing grace how sweet the sound
That saved a wretch like me.

Most of the men in the neighborhood could read Chronicles by spelling half the words, while all had either read Bunyan and eighth of Romans, or heard them read. Bunyan supplied them with experiences, Romans with texts to prove predestination; the former enjoyed the favor and the affection, the latter, the authority. On Sundays most of the country flocked to meeting, the wags to swap horses and whittles, and to bet on the coming races; the Christians, as was fitting, to hear the sermon, and relate their experiences. The sermon was sure to be on foreknowledge or free-will, and to contain a definition of eternity; the experiences embraced reminiscences of headless apparitions, or voices of pulseless corpses wrapped in coffin sheets. Of that antique age Solomon Kimzey, of whom honorable mention has already been made, was the oracle, his brother-in-law, Brawley, the butt. Solomon aye preached the same sermon, which aye had the same effect—that is, it left the women crying, and the men discussing election. I will not slander Solomon by confidently affirming that he was a seer of spirits, but then Solomon had a taste for the marvelous, and delighted in the tales of Drew. He relished a tough story well, laughed heartily, smoked a pipe in decency, and never said so fervent a grace as when a huge turkey-cock just from the spit lay before him. For sir cock he was always duly thankful as becomes a Christian to be. He enjoyed a rusty wife, had hearty children, and abounded in affections at times a little errant, as vulgar people hinted, but then such folks are so addicted to tattling.

Brawley was clearly called and sent; but for what purpose Heaven never informed the world, and the world never found out. He never bored an audience except when he made a speech, nor delighted one except when he kept silent. His face was a thing to be detested and shunned by women *enceinte*; and when drolls went in quest of gesture Brawley supplied the model.

Another feature of those primitive times, which deserves men-

tion here, was the neighborhood fortune-teller. She was always a noticeable character, with a squint eye, a single tooth, "a nose and chin that threatened ither," a weird voice, stiff fore-finger, wore specks, and took snuff. The instrument with which she divined was a teacup with coffee-grounds in it. Over this she would brood awhile and gibber, when all the secrets of earth and hell stood naked to her peep. The wife you were going to marry, the children to have, she could tell with infallible certainty. The very spot she could name where you might find your stolen horse, or stray pig. She was great to tell where bags of gold lay deep emboweled in the earth; where the bones of murdered men lay rotting; and was the true conservator of the morals of the vicinage. During her life no rake might attempt the "illicit rove," belle play false with her lover, or neighbor steal his neighbor's hams or kail. All alike feared her and kept the peace as decent folks should do.

The country pedagogue of those undegenerate days also merits a paragraph. He was generally a chuffy man, five feet six, with gray hair, and fine girth—a man who cracked of definite articles, copulative conjunctions, Hoogley's bay, and ciphering; could tell the day of the month by the 'almanac, and brogue your moecasins; pulled teeth, bled and puked the neighbors; took grog with you when dry; wrote your will, and prayed for you when dying. He was deacon in the church, justice of the peace, auctioneer, and general counselor at law, prescribed for gout and cancer, and was a robust believer in witchcraft; he was always elected Captain on muster days, gave advice in bad cases of rupture and hair-lip; was president of the debating club, judge at shooting-matches, held children when christened, and gave lectures as to the best time in the moon to salt meat and plant snaps. In the school-room he was a philosopher and a tyrant, made but few impressions on the mind, left many on the back, taught the boys to make manners, and the girls to courtesy; at noon played bull-pen, knucks, and hull-gull; and at all other times was a gentleman and an astrologer.

The corn-shucking of these days "lang syne" must not be forgotten in this brief sketch. This was an occasion which always brought the whole neighborhood together. The women met to brag on their babies, drink stew, knit, and discuss the best method of setting blue-dye; the men to shuck corn, take rye, recount battles with bruin, and tell of long shots at deer; the boys to spark and blush; the girls to ogle and fall in love.

Next to the corn-shucking, the winter quilting and hoe-down were the pride of this long past. These were my delight. In the quilting you sat close beside your bonny lassie; in the hoe-

down you touched her hand, and saw her ankle. This over you made love to her in the corner, while she slapped your jaws and pouted. But to me the chief attraction at the quilting was the huge stacks of pumpkin pies which graced it, of which I am not conscious up to this sitting that I ever had enough.

Such were some of the persons and scenes of the delightful period in which my early life was passed. Whether they were the best suited to foster genius and strengthen virtue is a question I shall cheerfully leave to the casuist. To them I turn and on them think with no common feeling. But the neighborhood where Haynesville stands, Collet lives, and I was reared, and held my first meeting possessed other noteworthy objects besides these.

Deer roamed through the woods, foxes burrowed in the cliffs, panthers screamed, wolves howled, and squirrels lived in almost every hollow tree. To hunt these foxes and climb these trees was the delight of my heart, and my constant Sunday's calling. This was the great sin of my early life. It was for this sin that honest Collet Haynes augured my future end. As predestinarians rode to meeting and heard my hounds, they sighed, wagged their heads, and muttered, "the hemp is growing that hoists him." But for all their hard sayings and hard wishes, I now take deep pleasure in forgiving them.

It is proper here to add that the forerunning narrative antedates the time of my meeting by several years. It relates to a more primitive time—a time when the red man's tracks were still in the land, and bears were a weekly sight. At the time of my meeting great advances had been made on those times. The men had ceased to wear buckskin, the women dressed in calico, and drank green tea; ghosts were more rare, and Drew had migrated. Tents covered with elm bark were now quite out of fashion, boots were occasionally seen, the men used handkerchiefs, and women side-combs. Soap was no longer a myth to children, though starched bosoms still attracted much attention. The boys had now begun to carry riding whips, to chew, and the girls to flirt. The more able families could afford tables and biscuit on Sunday morning, while almost all had learned what sausage and spare-rib mean. Buggies and steamships were still fabulous things, while cock-fighting and log-rolling had fallen into desuetude. Collet Haynes had long since ceased to prophesy; old Henry Green was dead; though Andrew Fuller still persecuted truants for climbing his saplings, and regularly made the circuit of his estate every sabbath to see if any neighbor had broken a riding-switch or stolen a pig-nut. Austin King, dear man, was now justice of the peace, and Wash. Huffaker county judge, though

Wash. still used his thumb and finger and not his handkerchief. A shingled roof and a brick stack were now not absolutely unknown, and men used chains instead of withes in plowing. The use of pins was altogether abandoned, and fish were caught with hooks as in other countries. Balls had taken the place of the hoe-down, the fiddle that of juber; horns were all the fashion, and grog was never named. The Christians discussed the mode of baptism, the operation of the Spirit, and infant church membership, as in other decent countries; they only denied the existence of Styx, and the revolution of the earth; the old preachers kept on their coats while preaching, and took a little only when feeling bad. A young man no longer consulted a witch when he wanted a wife, but went directly to his sweetheart; invalids took henbane, boneset, and composition for diseases of the spine and fits, and Weekly Dale cured warts by art of hocus-pocus. Solomon Kimzey was now no more heard of than an antedeluvian fossil; Philip Gill had been called, and had entered regularly upon the work of grunting, clapping, and brawling; and spent most of his time in giving practical lessons on the ways in and the ways out of churches. The Smith clan had all either died or left, and the country rested and praised the Lord. Haynesville, shot-guns, pacing horses, and red-top boots, however, had not yet made their appearance; although deer skins were thrown aside, and the young men were using saddles. Such was the state of the country about the time of my meeting, for which it is now proper I should begin to prepare the mind of the reader.

In the midst of this primitive community my father settled more than thirty years ago. He migrated West from Tennessee for the sake of the game which then abounded in Missouri. He was a man of quick, strong, sense; tall, and straight as an Indian, with a flashing eye, and black hair; of manly bearing, candid, frank, and generous to a fault; loved his friend with an intense love, and hated his enemy with an intense hate—a man of great courage, quick temper, but cool and self-possessed. His rifle, his pony, and his dog were the idols of his heart. Alas for the buck on which he drew that bead or touched that fatal trigger. He was tender hearted as a woman, perfectly truthful, and exceedingly improvident. He never owned less than one horse and a gun, seldom two of either, and never a home in his life. Though himself irreligious, he respected religion in others; never suffered his children to use improper language, and encouraged them with a whole heart to speak the truth always. When he sinned he repented in exquisite pain; when mad he was daring as a fiend. He detested oppression, and sympathized with the humble and

the injured to a degree which at times made him wild and dangerous. When he could boast a tent for his wife and children, with a boundless prospect of deer, his spirits were high, and life was a luxury. A few months after we landed in Missouri he died—died of small-pox. Can I ever forget that night! A single neighbor man stood by him to speak of death and help him in his last prayer. This prayer ended, he called my mother to the bed and said: "Mary, if thus far through our hard life I have ever wounded you or treated you amiss, forgive me now." He then called his weeping children up, looked them all kindly in the face, and simply said, "farewell, poor, helpless little things." He now turned on his right side, drew up his feet, and added, "in a few moments I shall be gone." These were the last words of Leven Lard. In an instant he was dead. That night not a soul staid with us, for all feared the dreadful disease. Josiah Cogdell, to whom grateful allusion has just been made, straightened my father in the bed where he lay for the night, and then left to wait on others in the same affliction. There in a cheerless cabin, far away in the wilds of the West, with not a relative within a thousand miles, nor a candle to give us light, sat through the lone night my poor mother and the hand that traces this, and watched that silent body. Next day in a linn coffin it was laid to rest, not one of the family being permitted to be present, and now sleeps in a quiet wood about half a mile south of Haynesville. In the dark shade of that noble forest is a fitting place for the long, deep repose of that daring hunter, tender heart, and chivalrous pioneer.

In a short time after this my mother invested about all she had, which consisted of a few horses, in a pre-emption. This afforded us a rather pleasant temporary home, with the prospect of a permanent one. Here my brother and self, both very young, made a crop. We had collected together a few cows, pigs, and other necessities of a scanty life, and were beginning to feel that the prospect of bitter want was past. We looked forward with high hopes to the time when we might be able to enter the land and call it home. Meantime it was thrown into market and we did not know it. A man by the name of Humphrey Best went to the office and entered it. He at once turned us out of the house, and for our home and all our labor gave us not a cent. I shall drop the veil of secrecy over the suffering which that event entailed upon my kind mother and her six dependent children. Long and hard she struggled to keep us together. What I learned and saw of human nature during that dreary night, for it was very dark, and very cold, I pray kind heaven to forgive, but I never wish to forget. The ten thousand ways, wholly unknown to the more favored of the human family, in which the

indigent widow and indigent orphan can be cheated, swindled, slighted, mistreated, insulted, and imposed upon, could make me hate even the earth itself had not the Saviour and friend of such slept in it. I could now name some of these men, who at present are fond of smiling on me, and calling me brother, but whom I have never ceased to recognize as villains and hypocrites. At length the painful fear was fully realized that as a family we could no longer be kept together. The day of separation at length came. To us all death would have been a relief. Thinly clad and poorly shod we stood round the humble hearth for the last time. Our mother's heart was breaking. As my brother and self stood beneath the little cabin eaves, just ready to take leave of the only objects on earth dear to us, and thus close the saddest scene of our lives, my mother said: "my dear boys, I have nothing to give you but my blessing and these two little books." Her soul was breaking and she could say no more. She then drew from her bosom two small Testaments; and as her tears were streaming and lips quivering, she screamed as if it were her last, and placed them in our hands. We all said good-by, and that family was forever broken on earth. Yet, gentle reader, think us not poor as we turned from that mean abode. We bore with us a Christian mother's blessing and the precious words of Jesus. *We were wealthy boys.* To that little book and the memory of that scene my future life owes its shaping. I never neglected the one, thank Heaven, nor forgot the other. We were now a scattered dependent family—drudges for other people. The days, the months, the long, long years, lay like leaden weights on our gloomy, bleeding spirits. Would that I could blot them from memory and never think of them more. O! you who fancy that, because children have been reared in want, and away from the blandishments of refined life, they cannot feel, and have no tears to shed, would you could pass one night which I have passed; and yet I would spare you the grief.

Time dragged heavily on and I was now well-nigh grown. I was deeply religious in feeling, though not so in life; for I knew not how to be so. I listened to the various parties of the day, and they neither gave me relief nor gave me light. All was black as erebus where they ministered. At length I heard J. P. Lancaster of the Christian church—and where is now that once sweet silvery voice, fine form, and clear strong brain—again I say where? Lord, have mercy on all thy frail erring children! Before that meeting closed I was a Christian. Bless the Lord, oh, my soul, and all that is within me bless his holy name. My little book was now doubly dear. I read it, committed it to memory; thought on it through the day, and dreamt of it through the

night. It was the light, the feast, and the joy of my soul. Meantime I had made the acquaintance of brother Gaines, and Mason Summers; and two truer men to the young disciple, especially to the timid modest one of real worth, who thinks of spending his days in doing good, Heaven never made. These two dear men walked with me, talked with me, said gentle things that emboldened me, apologized for my blunders, until at length, I am ashamed to say it, they shaped my poor crude thoughts preacherward. The rest I shall not tell. Time passed away; and I had an appointment to speak, I will not call it preach, in my old neighborhood. My soul strove with God in prayer in prospect of the meeting. I was painfully sensible of the solemn and delicate responsibility I was about to assume. How shall I prepare for it? I said to myself. Shall I make notes, elaborate notes? I asked. Not a note shall be made, was my decision. I was judicious enough to remember that the mind only works free and easy over what the mind knows well. I determined, therefore, to study my subject soundly, and trust to God, a true heart, and common sense for all the rest. A better decision I never made. If I have ever delivered a speech which suggested to any human mind the word success, I owe it to the resolution then formed, and since kept. Think, my dear young preaching brother, think of your subject; think of it till your head aches and heart is clear; think till you cannot make a blunder; think till every point is transparent, luminous; think till the mind bounds over it, and plays about it with the ease of the gamboling fawn. Then, and, only then, may you expect success. Heaven furnishes you the matter, but thinking alone can make it yours. The secret of your triumph will be your thinking. Think like no one else, preach like no one else; especially repeat no one's speech, imitate no one; be yourself, true to yourself, persevere, *persevere*, and then the victory is sure.

The day of my appointment at length came, and I was present. The whole neighborhood had flocked together—some, let me hope, to weep, but others to swear, and stare, and jest. Many were there whom I was glad to see, some whom I had hoped never to see again. Faces were in that audience which awakened pleasing memories of other days—memories of justice done and kindness shown to my mother and her little flock; but others again, in each of which I read some half concealed guilty look, that carried me back through days long past to acts of baseness, which though then forgiven were not forgotten. I tried to rise high over all the unpleasant by-gone, and in the fervor of my soul prayed alike for all, and wished that all might in the end be saved. Over these hills I had once run deer and foxes, and other game to the great

scandal of Pharisees. I was now, however, no longer the heedless youth I had then been. For one thing I felt proud and thankful—my heart was free from the sense of crime, and my character was without a spot. In that great crowd was not an eye from which I turned because of even the slightest wrong ever meant or done. My brow therefore was erect, and conscience clear. Thus I had returned in a new character to my old haunts, and felt that I could afford to bear myself magnanimously towards all, and did so.

My speech was long, earnest, and elementary. Mason Summers was present and sang for me, as no one sang in those times but Mason Summers. During my effort I enjoyed his approving look; and though I may have tripped, his eye never fell till I closed. The few brethren who were present seemed pleased, my poor mother was not ashamed, the sects pouted, and Gill muttered, puffed, and grunted. From day to day, and night to night the meeting went on. I stuck close to the Book, kept near the ground, and the Saviour stuck close to me. My method was to take a single thought at a time, present it in every light in which I could, and then leave it like a quick seed in the ground to bear its fruit in its season. On that method, though struck out at the instant, I have never improved to the present. The excitement rose high, and the meeting continued. The sects grew furious, wags grew serious, Gill continued to mutter and growl, but never swore a word. For the success of the meeting I intensely prayed, and believe that every brother who attended prayed. To the community the scene was novel indeed. The doctrine was new, the preacher was new, but whether both were from heaven or hell, many seemed at a loss to say. On the meeting went. The preaching was debated, positions dissected, the Bible read to defend and refute; while I was the object of alternate blessings and abuse. Some thought me a fit subject only for the art of an Indian Thug, others vowed I was inspired; one declared me a prodigy, another pronounced me a fool. A few regretted that Collett's forecastings had not come to pass; others thought me excellent to take catamounts, while not a few had always known that I was destined to come to something. All of which, I am thankful to say, had about as much effect on me as the snuff the talkers took.

The people began to confess their faith in Christ, and to be immersed. The excitement was now high, the feeling deep, and the meeting the universal talk. The ribaldry of the first day had ceased, punsters hushed, good men thanked God, and Gill raved. My former companions in the hunt and chase came forward to own the Lord, old men followed, women followed, while others

stood off amazed, and wondering to what strange end the world was coming. I shall not soon forget an incident which occurred at the first immersion. Jerry Holt, an honest man and kind, had been reared in North Carolina, and up to that date had never witnessed an immersion. He soberly and decently watched on the shore. I led my sister into the water. It was a clear fine pool in a little stream overhung with copse and jungle, and lying deep down in the shade of lordly trees. The prescribed form of words was said, and she was buried and raised with Christ. We walked up slowly out of the water. Jerry Holt laid his hand on his nearest neighbor and said: "Cousin Austin, as sure as Christ is the Son of God and the Bible is not a lie, that and that only is baptism; I will never submit to anything else." Yes, dear Jerry, that and that only is baptism; and I am glad to know, that, though you are connected with a body unknown in the Bible, you never submitted to anything else. Thus, too, would immersion strike all, if all were as candid, just to reason, just to the truth, as that plain honest farmer.

Amongst the many that joined during the meeting, I take much pleasure in naming my old school teacher, Austin R. King. I owe him a debt of deep gratitude which I am not ashamed to confess. His education was not high, nor his ability as a teacher uncommon. Yet he possessed this eminent merit—that he inspired his boys with the most impassioned love of learning. Their thirst under him for the Pierian spring became romantic and intense. He pointed them to the far distant scholarly heights, and shouted to them, on, boys, on. He awakened hopes, sneered at obstacles, cited illustrious names, till he left his pupil feeling that none but a dastard would shrink to dare the toil for the sake of the dazzling honor that beckoned on. And if more did not leave him to become honorable and useful, if not distinguished, let none lay the charge to the tremulous form that still resides a mile west of Haynesville. When the time comes for the great Teacher to mete out to the obscure, humble worker the reward due the cup of cool water, I pray him to remember my old benefactor with a fitting honor.

When a boy, as already named, I was very poor, and always meanly clad. Many a time when I went to the homes, and that was not often, of the more favored, to spend a night with neighbor boys, I witnessed looks and winks and nods, and heard hints and whispers that sent me back with a bitter, bitter heart wishing I slept the sleep of my father. Strange were my sensations as I now led these same persons down into the water to bury them with Christ. I thought of the past and forgave, of the present and thanked God and wept. Be gentle, my wealthy friend, to

that ragged orphan boy, who glides about your house, so timid, shy, and silent. A tender heart, as easily crushed as a frail flower, and a bright noble mind may lodge in that cold lean exterior. Again I say be gentle.

As I passed from and to meeting many a familiar object met my eye, which awoke reminiscences of other days and other scenes. The trees I had cut for squirrels lay rotting beside the road. There was the field in which I had worked for a dime a day, and the acre I had grubbed for a pair of shoes. I passed the hollow where Drew had seen a ghost, the point where I had slaughtered a deer, saw the linn from which I had brought an eagle, and the spot where Stanton had killed my dog. A little heap of rubbish was all that remained to mark the site of the cabin where my father had died, and on which Mrs. Bill Crawford had seen him sitting in his winding sheet long months after he was buried. There stood the mill on which he had worked, and the elm he had peeled for bark to cover our tent. I remembered the very slope on which Elder Green had stood when he pronounced A. Campbell a child of hell—the first time I had ever heard that name. The bush was yet standing in which the Grand River woman had seen the Saviour, and the corner of the fence in which Garret Green had tried to hide from the Devil and the Holy Ghost.

But amongst all these objects the ones which touched me deepest and had the most immediate bearing on the meeting were some hickory trees. In the early times to which the first part of this piece alludes, we could afford no candles. Yet even then I was fond of reading, and prided myself on the facility with which I could commit to memory the Bible. Either at home or abroad I would toil through the day, and then commit my chapter at night. Whole books of the New Testament were thus treasured up. The bark of these trees afforded me the light by which this work was done. There they stood naked as the day when I had peeled them. I had now returned to preach to the people the truths I had thus acquired. How strange it seemed! I little dreamt as I lay on my cabin hearth by the light of that blazing bark, that I was then collecting the strength which should one day induce a scene such as I was then passing through. But how remote many a time, and seemingly independent, are the incidents which God yet links together so as to cause the one to give rise to the other. When well done, truly is nothing done in vain.

My first meeting after two weeks closed—closed with honor to the name of Christ, and deep joy to many a spirit. The church at Oakland was organized, numbering in all about sixty names. For long years afterwards it was a prosperous and happy body.

Few churches ever achieved more for a community than did it for the one in which it stands. Other earnest men bestowed their labors on it; and other successful meetings followed the first. Its numbers were swelled to hundreds. But in the course of time troubles arose and marred its harmony, and grieved its faithful members. It has not been so prosperous since. Petty ambition and ignorance are bad elements to domineer over a church. When small men and inexperienced are placed at the helm, the hardest may well tremble for the fate of the ship. Besides, within the last few years, I am pained to hear, politics—that infernal snake of the day to churches generally, have been invited to rule its fate. That snake now lies coiled within its walls, is warmed by its stoves, crushes its bones, chills its blood, and stiffens all its joints. Politics in the church! my soul, what church can prosper where such is the case? None. The Lord keep the churches to their legitimate business of causing the truth to be preached, and taking care of the children of God. My prayer for the church at Oakland is, that its faithful may be kept in peace, that they may dwell together in love, be gentle and kind to one another, bear each others burdens, forgive as they ask to be forgiven, and all meet at last in the presence of Christ where sin and tears shall never be known.

Though I have no high reason, to be sure, to be attached to Haynesville, or any living thing connected therewith; yet my spirit loves to haunt those hills and woods. They remind me of departed joys, departed never to return—of sorrows fled, forever fled. My soul goes there to mourn as the dove returns to its nest to sigh, from which its young are taken. My heart lingers there-about and cannot long stay away. Links lie buried in that dust, which keep my thoughts from wandering far. Beside a frail father now lie a sister and my mother; and a better mother than mine will never hallow a grave in Clinton. She was a woman of iron will, strong, very strong, quick sense, with even a mother's sweetest, kindest heart. With her, religion was an ever burning never lessening flame; faith a passion, bold and grand; and hope a bacon that blazed through earth's darkest night. Her temper was always even, her judgment so unerring as to make it almost a marvel. Her instincts were keen and far-reaching; and she read human nature with a precision which seemed little less than infallible. I never knew her mistaken in a man or woman in my life; and she was the best talker of her sex I ever heard. Not that she talked elegantly, for such was not the case. Her voice was horizontal, her talk subdued and flowing. It never cost her a seeming thought or effort. Yet like a deep, strong, smoothly gliding stream, it never stopped till it bore you up to the very

mark. Her powers of description, always so easily and gently playing, were positively amazing. But her chief power lay in her quick, subtle religion. When she touched your heart she left it literally steeped in faith, and hope, and love. Patient and meek, she bore the ills of her hard life with a resignation and a fortitude which I feel to be simply sublime. Her last moments, like her life, were full of high trust in Christ. To her children she gave her blessing, for earth breathed a prayer, and then went hence. May that little band she so tenderly loved and faithfully served, meet her in peace, as the last groan of each is hushed, is the fervent wish of the hand that pens this.

TO THE FRIENDS OF THE QUARTERLY.

WE learn in traveling over the country that many persons who subscribed to the Quarterly four years ago, are expecting the work to be sent on that subscription. To all such it is proper to say, that four years work many changes in a subscription list. Half the names then obtained have by this time died, changed residence, or would not want the work. Were we now to send the work to them, half the Nos. sent would be a total loss. We hope therefore that none will think hard because they have not received the work, and that all who may want it, will renew their subscriptions at once.

Again, many send for a sample of the work, or wish to subscribe for a half year only. To all such we wish to say, that while we have every inclination to gratify them, we cannot. We have a definite and the same number of the Quarterlies printed every three months. Hence to send one or two Nos. breaks a set, and is just as expensive as to send for the whole year. Let all therefore subscribe for the whole year, or for the full four Nos.

To each subscriber to the Quarterly we wish to make a direct personal appeal. This, my dear brother, dear sister, is the second No. of the work. You now have a fair sample of what it will be. You know that the times are hard, and can well imagine that success is difficult. Will you, then, each one of you, resolve that you will obtain and forward the name of *one* new subscriber. Remember we ask for *only one*. Think for a moment how small the labor this will be to you. Yet by it our subscription list would be doubled. In kindness then we ask this humble favor.

THE CAUSE AND THE WORK IT NEEDS.

For the last seven months we have been traveling over Kentucky, preaching incessantly, never less than a week at a place, very rarely more. We have not been an idle spectator of scenes, nor a careless observer of events. Previous to that time we had a minute and extensive acquaintance with the condition of the cause in Missouri. We hence feel prepared to speak of its prospects at least in these two States.

For awhile the shock occasioned by the disastrous and unhappy state of the country was great and alarming. Men of small faith in the presence of God and in the conservative and uniting power of the truth ceased to work, and some even to hope. Predictions of ruin and of dissolution of churches were loud and common. The vision of the longest sighted was short, and the future wore a threatening look. General distrust seized upon the public heart, and even the warmest friends grew cold and shy. Many had no courage to meet; and where any met at all, it was rather to mourn over and discuss other matters than to worship God with a whole, single heart. It is but just to add that where brethren felt that life, liberty, property, country—all, in a word, was at stake on the bad chances of war, it could hardly be expected in common reason to be otherwise. It will not do to say that our zeal burned as steadily as ever before, and that we had only become more than usually excited in a different direction. The truth is even our zeal itself had positively depreciated in vital force. It was no longer the grand power it had been the thirty years before. It was still alive, but its life was the life of the still silent coal, rather than of the flashing vivid flame. Sadness brooded over every heart; and spirits were very low. Many felt as if the night of death would be a night of relief. Moderate and temperate counsels were despised, while he who preached love and peace and kindness amongst his brethren was set down as a traitor to his country. That some improvement has been made on this state of things in the last year cannot be denied; but it is deeply to be regretted that no radical cure can yet be announced.

How long this state of things will continue none can confidently say; but in the meantime it is a state which deserves to be closely watched. Satan is not idle now, nor his schemes without effect in our ranks. He will most certainly take advantage of this period of general mental dissipation, coldness, and tendency to diduction to work mischief. Indeed, he has already done it. Now is the time to hatch successful heresy, and to introduce illicit practices. Men will sometimes do strange things merely

to spite those whom they do not like, and resort to very unwarrantable courses to establish their right to do as they please. There is no danger, for example, in going to hear a mean sly sectarian preach because, for political reasons, we dislike to hear our own brother—none of course! none in taking our children with us—not at all! There is no danger in sectionalizing our Missionary Societies so that even excellent brethren may fall out over them and separate—certainly not! for division is right, and happy is he that causes it! But we shall not further particularize. In all this can the sagacious eye see nothing of the deep strategy of Satan? But what shall be done? and what is the line of duty which the present crisis suggests as the true one, and therefore, the safe one?

I. My first answer respects the kind of preaching demanded just at this time. Understand me reader. I do not mean that our preaching shall be either grand or simple, impassioned or calm. This is not what I mean. I speak not of manner, I speak of matter. *Our preaching, then, should be pre-eminently and emphatically rudimental.* The very seeds of truth and first lessons of the gospel are what we now need. Fill both mind and heart with these. If they salt not the soul and save it nothing else will.

II. Nothing could be of more service to us now than a little tough piquant controversy with our old hereditary foes—the sects. Some may doubt this. We are bold to think we know what we say when we thus speak. You never take your brother's part half so quickly as when you hear an old enemy slandering him. A little pressure from this quarter just now would have a fine effect. Let no brother fear to provoke it. To see the old lance of John Smith and battle-blade of J. T. Johnson furbished up once more would gladden us to the heart. A little of the blood these grand old warriors used to draw would be no mean bond of union now.

III. We especially need in the field at this time a class of deeply pious, earnest, elementary, working preachers. We want a class of noble men, magnanimous fellows, with genial kindly hearts—men that can ignore petty differences of opinion, and give you a hand so warm, a look so kind, a grip so strong, as to send a thrill of joy to your heart—these are the men we want. We want men that shall hang the mantle of their sweet fluent love on every church where they minister; that shall impress all with their high Christian-bearing, and leave the very atmosphere where they move burdened with mercy and sympathy—men that shall go forth to weep over the weaknesses of frail humanity, to be gentle to the erring, and a source of deep comfort to the whole family of God.

IV. Above all, the work we now need is work to save our churches. These divided and in ruin, all is lost: these saved, all is safe. Every effort of the preacher's soul and prayer of his heart should look to this. By the hopes of the future, and memories of the past; by the prayer of Jesus and the unity of truth, let our churches be besought to continue one. Let no work be held as subordinate to this. Let it be a chief, a constant work.

LARD'S QUARTERLY.

VOL. I.

MARCH, 1864.

No. 3.

SPIRITUAL INFLUENCE AS IT RELATES TO THE CHRISTIAN.

IN a former article it was stated that the subject of Spiritual Influence is distributable into two parts; the first relating to the sinner, the second to the Christian. In that article the first part was treated of; in the present paper we propose to treat of the second part. As pertinent to the object we now have in view we cite the following passage of Scripture:

"If the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead, dwell in you; he that raised up Christ from the dead, shall also quicken your mortal bodies, by his *Spirit that dwelleth in you.*" Rom. 8: 11.

To be more explicit, my purpose, in the present piece, is to vindicate this passage, especially that part of it which I have caused to be printed in italics. To some the word vindicate may sound strange. I regret that a necessity of any magnitude should have demanded its use; yet such is the case. Even in our own ranks are some who stand in doubt as to the sense couched in the words I have rendered emphatic. With these brethren no strife is proposed. They are true men so far as I know them, and hold their doubts in sincere hearts. Not one wish have they to depart even in the smallest particular from the teachings of holy writ. Enable them to see the truth and see it clearly and they are not the men to reject it. Such at least is my faith. Certainly these brethren do not pretend to disbelieve the passage; but ask them for their faith in it, and in candor I must say they seem to have none. Their tortuous mode of explaining it too clearly evinces this; and even their ingenuity is of a kind so peculiar as to be significant. The large desire I cherish that the whole truth shall be accepted by all men, and especially that we, as a people, may, in every matter of revelation, be "perfectly joined together in the same mind," prompts me to attempt the defense, and to offer the suggestions herein following. I shall approach the subject, however, not directly but circuitously. In other words, there are certain important preliminaries which I think it necessary to lay

down first, and to which I hope to have a very general assent, before entering upon the work now specially proposed. I at once proceed to these preliminaries.

That we have the word *God* in current use cannot be denied. It is, moreover, with us a significant word; that is to say, it has a meaning, as certainly a meaning, as any other word in the language we use. No one for a moment believes the term a mere empty sound. There is a conception of the human mind, a real conception, for which it stands. This conception may be a very inadequate one, as I am quite ready to grant it is, still it is not the less real on that account. Now the question which I first raise, and the one which it is proposed to consider first, is this: *Whence that conception?* Next, as closely connected with this, and as bearing directly on the object we have in view, will come the question, whence the additional conception, if additional it be, of God as *spirit*? For, being once in possession of this latter conception, that is, the conception of spirit simply, we shall have no difficulty in accounting for its various modifications, whether these pertain to Spiritual intelligences or to the modes of their existence.

First, then, *whence the conception of God?* Now however we may differ as to other positions, on the following we must agree: that we obtain the conception either from something without us, or from something within us. Let us now first inquire whether any thing without us, that is, whether any thing in the material world around us, is adequate to suggest this conception. The position has been long held, and as long debated, but is it true? The sequel must be our reply. We are, then, in the first place to interrogate nature in the premises. Her materials are to be consulted, her facts examined. Nothing must be allowed to escape. Whether atom or fact, if it contain the conception we are in quest of, it must deliver it up. As we by striking the flint with steel compel it to give out its hidden spark, so must we force the materials of nature to yield up their contents. If among these we discover the conception of God, it will be well; if not, then will nature have been consulted in vain.

But we in our present condition are not the most proper persons to conduct this investigation. We could judge much better what it is competent to elicit, and how much confidence it is entitled to, if we should see it conducted by another. We already have the conception of God; and this conception is most intimately incorporated with our thoughts. Indeed, so constantly does it reappear in our views, and so blended is it with our notions, that we find it impossible either to think or reason long in any direction, especially when searching for it, without meet-

ing with it. Nay more, so easily does it glide about among our thoughts, and so readily does it float up to the surface, that some have even supposed it to be the spontaneous product of the soil of the human soul. But in the correctness of this we have no faith. One thing, however, is certainly true, that we find it extremely difficult to free ourselves from its influence even for a moment. No matter where we look for it we find it; but the question is how came it there, or rather, did it originally and really exist there? We think not. The case resembles that of a mirror. When we look into one there is our face; neither does it appear to have just come there, but seems a permanent *locum tenens*. Still it was not there before, not till the presence of the real face located it there. So when examining a fact of nature to discover the conception of God, we, impregnated with it as we are, are sure to find it. But then did it originally and always exist there, or did the presence of the teeming mind place it there? We are much inclined to the latter view. When investigating some circumstance in nature to discover the conception in question, if at the instant we happen to be made sensible of its presence in the mind, how easy is it to persuade ourselves that it was just then suggested, when the truth is it was never out of the mind, and the very effort we have been making to discover it has only served the more effectually to obtrude it into notice.

But without protracting these remarks, we feel safe in thinking that we, who already have the conception, are not in a condition to conduct the proposed investigation as an original one, (and it should certainly be conducted in no other way), and that a consequent necessity exists for adopting some expedient to have it conducted for us. Let us now select a suitable person to perform this task, while we act the part of mere lookers-on. I have said select a suitable person; but a suitable person would be very hard to find. Indeed, such a person we cannot find at all. He must hence be a purely imaginary being. The following we deem the proper person:

He must be reared without ever seeing a human face, or hearing a human voice. He is not to have the remotest conception of the existence of another being like himself. His mind must be alike devoid of the idea of both man and God; and this it would be if reared as here supposed. We shall allow that he is possessed of native intellectual powers of the finest mould, that his observation is of wide range, and minute; in a word, that he is every way as well qualified for the task we are going to assign him, as can justly be imagined. Now this man we are to set to work on the materials around him, the materials of nature, for the purpose of testing whether any one of

them, or all of them together, can suggest to his mind the conception of God. We are now fairly ready for the experiment.

But before he undertakes it I wish to put his powers of discovery to the proof in a case involving far fewer difficulties. For this purpose I shall approach, unobserved by him, one of his most frequented paths, and in it lay my watch. Now the task I propose assigning him is this: To discover, by examining my watch, its maker. For if that watch has no power to suggest to his mind something like the true conception of a watchmaker, or if his mind is possessed of no powers sufficiently far-reaching to infer the latter from the former, then must I confess that I have no confidence in his ability to infer from nature the God thereof, or in the ability of nature to suggest the notion of its author. Certainly the resemblance (if the language be admissible), is quite as close between a watch and a watchmaker, as between nature and God. Nor will it be denied that the power of a watch to suggest the idea of its maker, is fully as great as that of nature to suggest the idea of God; and surely the distance between a watch and the hand that made it is nothing like so great as that between nature and its author. Neither can the suggestive force of a watch as a premise be regarded as less than that of nature as a premise, nor the fertility of the mind in making discoveries as less when working on the former than on the latter. On every conceivable ground, then, I regard this imaginary man to be fully as competent to collect the notion of a watchmaker from a watch as he possibly can be to collect the notion of God from nature. And I repeat, if he have no ability to do the former, I shall have no confidence in his ability to do the latter.

But he is returning along that path, and now pauses over my watch. He has it in his hand; what now are his sensations, and what the train of thought in his mind? None can confidently say. How true the question of the apostle: "what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him." But that man is closely inspecting my watch. Its color is not wholly new to his eye, its outward conformation is. He has never seen any thing exactly like it before. He sees its hands in motion, hears it tick, claps it to his ear, and thinks, (does he ever say?) it is alive, it is singing. But what next does he do with it? That it is a timekeeper is not in all his dreams. But he has seen eggs and eaten them, and my watch is not wholly unlike an egg; and he has seen nuts and cracked them, and my watch looks something like a nut. He resolves to inspect it a little further, and placing it between two stones cracks it. Out leap wheels and screws, and springs falling and quivering on the ground. Well, you are dead, he thinks: picks up a wheel and tries to eat it, does

not succeed, throws it down and reasons: you are not an egg, nor a nut, nor a crab, nor a bird. I have no use for you, and on he goes. Now just about this much labor and this much thought do I suppose the man would bestow on my watch.

Would it ever occur to him to ask who made it? *Who*, did I say? Ah, but we must not put that word in his lips. He cannot use *who*. To it there is no antecedent in his mind, hence he cannot use it. This antecedent is precisely the thing we want him to discover, but he seems slow to do it. Perhaps he might in his way inquire *what* made it, or *whence* did it come? For it is within his experience that birds make nests, and a watch is something like a nest; and that mussels come out of creeks, and a watch is something like a mussel. But that he should ever ask *who*, is impossible.

But the difficulties of the case are not yet exhausted. What is this man at work for? Of course, to invent in a watch the conception of its maker. Is he indeed? Not at all. That he is at work to invent this conception is in *our* mind, not in his. Can he go to work to make that discovery without the conception already in his mind? Must not the thought be there before the effort can be made? Clearly it must. If I set out to create a perpetual motion this implies that I already have in my mind both the conception of motion and of perpetual; otherwise I neither could nor would make the attempt. So with this man. His very effort to invent the conception implies that he already has it. Or if he be engaged in an effort to discover, he has no notion what, that he should, by mere accident, stumble upon the particular conception in our mind, is about as likely as that he should discover the philosopher's stone.

But in reply to this I shall perhaps be told that I am proposing for this man a very superfluous work; that nature itself furnishes him the conception of maker, and hence there is no necessity for an original effort to invent it. But this is not the work I am proposing for the man. Still I shall notice the position. How then, I ask, does nature furnish the conception? The reply, of course, will be that birds make nests, and beavers make dams, and this gives the notion of maker. Be it so, then; let us now suppose that this man already has the conception of maker, and with it let him return to my watch. How does he proceed? He infers a maker. Granted. But what kind of maker does he infer? Is it a beaver or a bird? I cannot tell. But of one thing I am most deeply convinced, that he will never infer a man as its maker, yet I propose for him no other work. I am very ready to grant that nature can furnish him the notion of maker simply, but more than this it cannot do. His experience must supply the

rest. The specific notion of the particular maker of any given thing nature does not furnish, especially where we have no means of obtaining it except from the thing made itself. Hence any such conception as this of my watch, this man can never collect from the watch itself. The watch has no power to suggest it, nor his mind to infer it.

But I must now, with small confidence truly, test the powers of this man on the works of nature. Can he by examining them discover the conception of God, or have they any power to suggest it to his mind? This is now the problem. On what shall he commence to work? Nothing could be more appropriate than an acorn; let it, therefore, be selected. To what now relates his first inquiry? Let us suppose to its origin: *whence came it?* Experience has taught him that it came from an oak, and the oak from an acorn, and that acorn from another oak, and so on. Where will he pause? If never, then, that matter is eternal will be his conclusion; and this of course excludes all notion of maker-ship. It is not unlikely that this first conclusion is the one on which he would settle down. But suppose he pauses, on what will it be? If on the acorn, this is purely arbitrary; if on the oak, the same. Yet on one or the other at last he must pause. Still let us suppose he pauses, and that, too, on the acorn; what then? Does he ask whence came it; if so, what answer does he obtain? He has seen birds make nests, but this is not a nest: he has seen beavers make dams, but this is not a dam. We repeat, what answer does he obtain? He cannot think that it began of itself, or created itself; for he has no experience or knowledge to this effect. Perhaps he vaguely concludes that it was made; and if so, this is about all. He cannot ask *who* made it, for he has not the conception of persons, especially as makers. True he has the conception of himself, but not as an original maker of any thing. Now, even allowing that, by reduplication of himself, he has formed the conception of persons; still all the experience he has is against the idea that persons are makers, especially in the sense in which he must suppose the acorn made. He can never ask who made it. The only question he can ask is *what* made it? He has seen birds make eggs, and oaks make acorns; and these must furnish the model for all his makers. Again, the idea of unity is not an element in his conception of makership. Makers with him are many and not one. His ultimate creators, therefore, would be a group of mere material things and animals. He would never arrive at the conception of a single personal God as the creator of all things. This conclusion is too high for him.

But even granting, what I am satisfied is against all probability, that this man might in the course of time form to himself the

conception of a great First Cause of all things, what, I ask, would be the character of that cause? Would it be that it is spirit? Never. In all the realm of nature as known to him there is not one atom or one fact to suggest this to his mind. Matter itself cannot give the notion of spirit. Neither has the human mind the power so to bridge the gulf between them, that it can pass from the one to the other; nor yet so to use the one as a premise, that it can infer the other. Even fancy in her wildest gambols never yet bounded the chasm that separates the material from the spiritual. Let all the energies and material of nature be laid under contribution, yet will they not yield the conception of God as *spirit*. That conception is not in them, hence it cannot be obtained from them. I hence dismiss the inquiry as to the things without us.

I may here state that there are several passages of Scripture which are supposed by some to bear on the question just dismissed, and which I should like to examine did time permit. Some of these appear to favor, others to disfavor the views now expressed. Their examination, however, would protract this paper to much too great a length; it is hence waived.

But perhaps we shall be told that all that is claimed for the things without us, that is, the material world around us, is that they can suggest the conception of a great First Cause simply, but without determining his character; and that it is the peculiar province of the things within us to suggest the conception of spirit which, when once we have it, we immediately transfer to him. In order, now, to test the correctness of this position, let the things within us be consulted; and for this purpose I shall again have recourse to my imaginary man. He is now, therefore, to inspect the phenomena of his own mind and make his report thereon. We shall then be in a condition for an important decision.

On turning his attention to the phenomena of the inner man he is struck with their multiplicity and variety. No attempt, of course, need be made to enumerate all these. A few, as in the case of outward nature, will serve for the experiment we are to make. He thinks, he remembers, he hopes, he fears; of these operations he is distinctly conscious. This much is certain. But in what does this thinking, *et cetera*, take place? Who does it or what does it? That thinking suggests the conception of a thinker is readily granted; nay more, that in the act of thinking we are conscious of ourselves as the thinking subject, is readily granted; but then does either the act of thinking or the consciousness that we are the thinking subject determine anything as to the nature or character of that subject? This is the decisive

question. Of spirit, be it remembered, this man as yet has absolutely no conception. Is there any thing, then, in mere thinking or even in himself as a conscious thinking subject to give it to him? We emphatically deny it. Even granting that, from the character of thinking as a phenomenon, he feels compelled to infer that the thinker is not material, still what is it? To say that it is not material assigns it no character, especially no positive character. Surely the inference that a thing is not material does not necessarily involve, to a mind that has it not, the conception of spirit. Allowing that spirit is in some sense the antithesis of matter, and that he infers this, still what is an unknown antithesis? That it is spirit certainly cannot be affirmed. The mere antithesis of darkness would not be to him that had it not the positive conception of light. And I do not think I err when I say that the word spirit contains for us a positive and not a mere antithetic or negative notion. Indeed he who has no conception of spirit except such as is implied in the words antithesis and negative, is as devoid of that conception, in my belief, as is the pen with which I write. Yet no other conception of thinker has he who infers it merely from the phenomenon of thinking. Such at least is my faith.

But in what, it may be inquired, is he most likely to locate the power of thinking? The answer we deem not difficult. He is conscious that his thinking is done in his head and not in his fingers or feet; and the only conception he has of his head is that it is a mere material organism. Hence his decision will be that it is his head that thinks. But that there is within him a curious worker who is pure spirit, distinct from his head, and that it is this that is doing his thinking will never occur to him; and if thinking will not give him this conception, we may well take for granted that nothing else within him will give it. On one condition only could he possibly infer a spiritual thinker from thinking. If it were previously given him that spirit alone can think, then of course from thinking would he be compelled to infer a spiritual thinker; and not only so, but from knowing that he himself thinks would he, in so far as he does this, infer that himself is spirit.

Therefore, from all the premises now before us, I conclude that neither from anything without us, nor from anything within us, nor even from both combined, can the conception of God as spirit be derived. Hence, had man been left to himself and to the things about him to attain it, he would never have had it.

Yet man certainly has the conception of God as spirit, and of spirit generally; whence, then, and how, did he obtain it? To this question neither revelation nor history replies directly. The

answer must hence rest on inferential grounds; and though so resting, it may, nevertheless, rise to a high degree of certainty. Now since nothing in the material world without us can suggest the conception, neither anything within us, there remains, it seems to me, but one other possible way in which it could have been obtained, namely: *direct revelation from God himself*. For even granting that the second man had it from the first; still to the first it was a direct revelation. That God communicated directly with man in his primitive state, or talked with him face to face, is admitted by all who accept the Bible as true. Now, that he would then and there impart to him those truths which most deeply concern his present and eternal welfare, I think simply certain. Among these what truth so important as the one which involves the true conception of God himself? None, surely none. But that truth is this: *that God is spirit*. Indeed, this very truth the Saviour himself has made the basis of all acceptable worship with God. His language is: "God is spirit," (not a spirit, but *spirit*), "and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." Truly then has this truth an inconceivable value. Again, no truth could so effectually prevent, as this, the deep dishonoring sin of idolatry to which man has ever shown himself so very prone. For if God be spirit, never can he be represented by a material idol. Among all the truths, then, which God would, at the first, be most likely to impart to man, to this must be assigned the first rank. Since, therefore, it was of such vast moment to him, and since he could not conceivably obtain it in any other way, I hence conclude that he derived it directly from God himself. But the first man being once in possession of the conception, we can readily understand how by tradition, oral and written, it could then become multiplied and extended to the rest of the human family.

Further, precisely as man obtained the conception that God is spirit, did he learn that he himself has a spirit. Let the reader not be startled. This is something which man does not know within and of himself, but something he has learned. It is with him a matter of faith and not of knowledge. God told him that he has a spirit, otherwise he would never have known it. What man knows is that he reasons, hopes, remembers, &c.; but these acts do not inform him what the nature of the subject is in which they take place. In them is no voice enouncing spirit as their author. This conception is not in them, at least for man; hence it cannot be derived from them. The mind is conscious only of its acts and states and of itself as a conscious subject. Of its nature it knows nothing, neither can the reason infer it. What this nature is man has learned from God and not from reason.

Nor is this all. Not only has he learned from God that he has a spirit, but from him also has he learned that this spirit is that within him which reasons, hopes, remembers, &c. For had God merely announced to man that he has a spirit, giving him no further information respecting it, he would never have inferred from that alone that this spirit is the thinking, hoping intelligence within him. These things are too far apart to be connected by man without superior aid. Last of all did he learn that not only from God comes all he knows, or strictly, believes, respecting his spirit, but even his spirit itself. This much it was necessary to teach him concerning his inner man: all else is left to his own subsequent thoughts and reflections. But man being once taught by direct revelation that he has a spirit, that this is from God, and that it is this, and neither matter nor a material organism that thinks and reasons within him, how easy all the rest. He then has no difficulty in accounting for the ten thousand operations and emotions of which he is conscious. The mysterious phenomena of the mind have then, though not a complete explanation, yet so far a solution as to become the overwhelming and satisfying proof of the reality and truth of what he has learned.

From all of which the conclusion is, that within and of himself man knows nothing strictly speaking of spirit or spirits, neither can he know anything except as he learns it from God, this information being at first direct, but at present mediate. Hence, particularly, of their modes and places of dwelling is he ignorant, save as he is taught them in the same way. From this, of course is to be excepted the information derived immediately from the operations of his own mind, which, when he is once in possession of the other information, becomes conclusive of its correctness.

Being now through with stating preliminaries, I proceed to make an application of them to the position or doctrine which it is the more especial object of this article to defend. That position is this: *That the Holy Spirit dwells in Christians.* But let it be first settled that the holy Scriptures assert this position. It will then be in place to inquire in what sense they assert it, i. e. whether literally or figuratively.

The verse cited at the commencement of this article may, for the sake of being very distinct, be divided into three parts, each having its separate meaning and value. The first part is a hypothesis: "*If the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you.*" The second asserts a fact: "*He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies.*" The third states how this fact will be effected: "*by his Spirit that dwells in you.*"

Now in regard to the first part, I hold it to be indisputable that

the apostle would never have used the language, "If the Spirit dwell in you," had it not been both the rule and the fact *that the Spirit does dwell in Christians*. The hypothesis is not false, and it can have no other foundation. But we need not treat the position even as indisputable. The following passage clearly asserts it: "*Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Spirit which is in you.*" 1 Cor. vi: 19. And this language is addressed not alone to inspired men, but to Christians generally. Let us now note the several items which it contains. First, we have the body, the human body, the body however not of men out of Christ, but of men in him, the body of Christians, and this body we have *as a temple*. Second, we have the Holy Spirit represented *as being in* this body, as dwelling in this temple. This much is absolutely certain. From these premises, therefore, it clearly appears *that the New Testament*, and that too in a part of it relating to Christians, *actually and positively asserts that the Holy Spirit dwells in them*. On these premises and this conclusion arise several questions demanding notice.

1st. Is the translation of the preceding passages true to the sense of the sacred original? I answer, it is, strictly so; and while it might admit of mere verbal alterations, it can admit of none in the least affecting the sense. The literal word-for-word translation of the second passage is this: *Know ye not that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit in you?* The verb which is to follow the Holy Spirit is not expressed, and is hence to be supplied. Analogy clearly requires that it should be *enoikei* and not *esti*. The passage would then read: know ye not that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit which dwells in you. But this clearly does not alter the sense. Against the translation therefore no objection can be urged.

2d. In what acceptance are we to take the term Spirit in the first passage? Can we possibly take it to denote, not the Holy Spirit, but a mere frame of mind or disposition? This latter position is sometimes assumed, but is it correct? We emphatically deny it. He would be deemed a bold man truly who should venture to render the passage thus: If the *disposition* of him that raised up Jesus from the dead, dwell in you; he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also make your mortal bodies alive by his *disposition* which dwells in you. Yet if this be the meaning of the passage no injustice would be done it by such rendering. But even granting the possibility, which we do not, of thus rendering the word Spirit in the first part of the verse, still clearly it could not be so rendered in the last part. For surely our bodies are neither kept alive now, nor will they be made alive at the resurrection, whichever view we take, by any mere disposition dwell-

ing in us, though it were even divine. But did even the slightest doubt exist as to the import of the word Spirit in the first passage, none can exist in regard to its meaning in the second. Here we have not the single word Spirit, but the combination, the Holy Spirit, both in the translation and in the original; and this combination, as is universally admitted, stands only for the Holy Spirit proper, and never for a disposition, or frame of mind. We are therefore to take the word Spirit as meaning strictly and properly *the Holy Spirit*.

3d. In what sense must we take the clause, "dwelleth in you?" To this inquiry we have two different replies involving two opposing theories.

The first is, that we are to take the clause literally; and hence to hold that the Holy Spirit actually and literally dwells in Christians.

The second is, that we are to take the clause not literally but figuratively; and hence to hold that the Holy Spirit dwells in Christians not actually and literally but representatively or through the truth.

But what kind of dwelling is this last? Let the language be understood. When it is said that the Holy Spirit dwells in Christians not actually and literally, but merely through the truth or representatively, the implication clearly is, *that the Spirit itself does not dwell in them at all*. On the contrary, *the truth only dwells in them, and this stands for or is in the place of the Spirit*. This unquestionably is the meaning of the language. Which now of these two theories are we to accept as the correct one? Of course the answer must depend on the acceptation in which we take the clause, "dwells in you." In what sense then shall we take it?

The rule by which the answer to this question is to be determined is this: A word, whenever met with, is to be taken in its common current sense, unless the subject-matter, the context, or a qualifying epithet forbids it. This rule is universal and imperative. What the phrase, *dwells in*, means is perfectly clear; namely, to live in or inhabit as a home. This, then, is the sense in which we must take the clause, unless prevented as the rule requires. Now, as to a qualifying epithet there is none; and a glance of the eye at the context is enough to satisfy us that there is nothing in it to prevent the clause being taken in its common acceptation. The only item, then, remaining to be considered is the subject-matter. But what is this? The subject of the sentence in hand is, *the Holy Spirit*; the thing said of it, *that it dwells in Christians*; and these together constitute the subject-matter or the thought presented in the sentence for consideration. Now if the subject-matter involves anything to prevent the clause being

taken in its ordinary sense, it must be the Spirit itself. Does the Spirit itself, then, prevent it? and, if so, on account of what?

1st. It cannot be on account of any thing in its nature. For of the nature or substance of the Spirit, strictly speaking, we know nothing. Of course, then, we cannot affirm that it is such as to prevent the Spirit dwelling in Christians. From this source, therefore, nothing can be deduced forbidding the clause being taken in its usual sense.

2d. It cannot be on account of its inability or want of power. Surely no one will deny that the Spirit dwells in Christians on the score that it cannot. We know no limits to its power; hence we must use no language which implies any.

3d. Nor can it be because it *will not*. To assert this would be presumptuous indeed. We know nothing to justify it; neither does the word of God teach it. It is hence inadmissible.

4th. Neither can it be owing to anything in the office of the Spirit in the work of redemption. For all we know of this office we learn from holy writ; and it is simply certain that we learn nothing there against the notion that the Spirit dwells in Christians; and hence nothing to forbid the clause being taken in its usual sense.

But without being more lengthy, I feel safe in concluding that we know nothing respecting the Spirit to prevent the clause in question being taken in its common current acceptation. Of course an arbitrary meaning is out of the question. I hence decide that the clause, "*dwells in you*," is to be taken in its ordinary literal sense. To this conclusion we are absolutely tied down by the preceding law of exegesis. We could not reject it if we would.

From all of which it follows that the assertion: "the Spirit dwells in you," cannot be taken in any other than a literal current sense. Therefore that the Holy Spirit actually and literally dwells in Christians is indisputably affirmed in the word of God; and hence cannot be rejected.

But in reply to all this we shall be told that God is said to dwell in Christians, (2 Cor. vi: 16), that this is not a literal, but representative indwelling, that is, a dwelling "through the Spirit," (Eph. ii: 22); and that consequently in this sense must we regard the Holy Spirit as dwelling in Christians.

This is the strong, and I believe regarded as the decisive, refutatory argument of those who deny a literal indwelling of the Holy Spirit. It is proper therefore to subject it to a severe examination. In the first place, then, I admit its premises but deny its conclusion. In other words I admit, first, that God dwells in Christians; and, second, that this dwelling is not literal but

through the Spirit. But on what ground is this admission made? Simply on the ground that the word of God actually asserts what is admitted. But can we grant so much respecting the case of the Holy Spirit, and on the same ground? Not at all. For though the Holy Spirit is certainly said to dwell in Christians; *it is not said to dwell in them through something else.* Hence one of the things which is said of God is not said of the Holy Spirit, and this is *the very thing* in issue. The difference, therefore, between the two cases is the difference between an actual assertion of holy writ, and a mere inference of the human mind. If it were anywhere asserted in the Bible that the Holy Spirit dwells in Christians through the truth, through faith, or through any thing else, no one need contend for a literal indwelling. An epithet qualifying the phrase, *dwells in*, in one place, might, I think, be fairly assumed to qualify it in every place. But such epithet we have not; and certainly it would be a most dangerous procedure to assume it.

Had the Bible said that God dwells in Christians, without an epithet qualifying the phrase, *dwells in*, then by every law of interpretation known to the learned world should we have been compelled to assert a literal indwelling. Now what in that case we should have been compelled to do, I hold that in this we are compelled to do. The Bible says that the Holy Spirit dwells in Christians; and this indwelling is nowhere qualified by an epithet. We are hence compelled to believe it literal. But why have we not an epithet? It is very certain we have none, but why? Can this question be answered on any other ground than this: that inspiration itself designed to make a difference between the indwelling of God and that of the Holy Spirit? One thing is certain, a deep difference is inscribed on the verbiage of the two cases; and this with me is conclusive that a corresponding difference exists in the facts described.

But the position, that God dwells in Christians not literally but through the Spirit, instead, it seems to me, of disproving that the Spirit dwells literally in them, establishes it. For how can God dwell in Christians through the Spirit if the Spirit itself does not dwell in them? When men say that the Spirit dwells in Christians through the truth, they claim for the truth a literal indwelling; yet when God is said to dwell in them through the Spirit, they deny of the Spirit a literal indwelling. Are they consistent?

But why should any one doubt that the Holy Spirit dwells literally in Christians? It cannot be on the ground that it is not clearly enough asserted. Still by some it is doubted, and we repeat, why? Is it on the ground of our inability to comprehend

and explain the fact and mode of such indwelling? We fear that this has much to do with the case. But is this a legitimate ground of doubt? In some cases it is, I grant, but not in this. Such is the nature of the fact asserted that we cannot comprehend it. This we are compelled to confess. Now instead of this inability being a just ground of doubt, it seems to me that it should be the very reverse. For the more sensibly we feel that we cannot and do not comprehend a fact, the less reason have we to question what the Bible says respecting it. Of all the possible grounds upon which a doubt might be founded, this should be the last.

Surely a literal indwelling is not doubted on the ground that we have no *sensible* evidence of the Spirit's presence. For neither *a priori* nor from the Bible have we any reason to conclude that such evidence would be afforded us. And gratuitously to assume it, and then make the assumption a ground on which to doubt the indwelling, is most unwarrantable indeed.

But it is perhaps doubted on the score that we have no conscious evidence of any emotions excited within us by the Spirit. I cannot admit it. I am as distinctly conscious at this instant of the presence in my mind of a love, joy, and peace, of exquisite sweetness, as I am of the purpose to end the sentence I am now writing; and these are called in the word of God "the fruit" of the Spirit. But as a rejoinder to this we may be told that men who are acknowledged not to have the Spirit, are no less vividly conscious of the same emotions. I positively deny it. That they have at times a love, a joy, and a peace of a certain kind, I grant; but they are not the broad love, the ineffable joy, and the deep unperturbable peace of the Christian. Only one thing more need be added here, that we are never conscious of an emotion *as from* the Spirit. Consciousness avouches only the emotion, the Bible announces whence it is.

From all the foregoing, therefore, it appears that we have no just ground on which to deny the literal indwelling of the Spirit. Hence such indwelling must be accepted as the clear authoritative teaching of holy writ. If this conclusion be not legitimate and fair I confess my inability to conceive the circumstances which could render it so.

It is proper here to state that many more passages of holy writ, besides the two we have cited, might have been adduced to settle the question in issue, but they have not, for the reason that they are liable to have an unfair advantage taken of the term Spirit which they contain. It has hence been thought best to quote only such as admitted of no doubt in the particular respect named.

Again, I have refrained from the use of the expression, personal indwelling of the Holy Spirit, because I am ready to concede that on certain grounds it is justly liable to objection. It was used by the writer of this piece, a few years since, in an article on the same subject, and he now admits the impropriety of the use. All that was meant by it however was, that the Spirit itself dwells in us, and not merely an influence proceeding from it, or something representing it; and this view is still, as has long since appeared in this article, firmly held.

But an important question remains still to be considered, namely: for what purpose does the Spirit dwell in Christians, or where is the advantage to them thereof? As bearing directly on this question we cite the following:

"Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities: for we know not what we should pray for as we ought: but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered. And he that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because (*that*) he maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God." Again, "That he" (God) "would grant you according to the riches of his glory, to be strengthened with might, by his Spirit in the inner man."

From these passages it appears that the work of the Spirit within us consists in *strengthening with might the inner man*, and in *helping our infirmities*. Of all the work we can imagine, this is the most important to us. We need not the Spirit's aid to give us new ideas or teach us new lessons. All we need in this way we abundantly have in the word of God. Neither do we need its aid to create within us absolutely new emotions and new aspirations. What we need is its aid in giving strength and direction to those we already have. *The Spirit helps our infirmities*. These are precious words. To be infirm is to be not firm, to be weak, not steady, not strong. And this infirmity inheres in the souls of all saints. Such is the condition of feeble, fallen man. How ready we all are to resolve to do right, yet how unequal to the task of performing. Truly has Paul told every Christian's experience in the words: "To will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not." Painfully do we all know this to be true.

But how does the Spirit help our infirmities? We cannot answer this question except in part. Let us, however, hear Paul again: "We know not what we should pray for as we ought." Christian reader, have you ever thoughtfully considered the deep significance of these words in the light of your own experience? Do you know *what* to pray for? Perhaps you think so. But do you know *how* to pray for it *as you ought*? Your soul confesses

you do not. Here is an infirmity you keenly feel, and as keenly the need of "help." But how does the Spirit help? It *intercedes* for us. In what way? "With groanings which cannot be uttered." Is there, then, after all, a mysterious philosophy and sense in the deep-drawn groans of the child of God? He is from home and a wanderer, in perils oft, oppressed with grief and cast down. Even when, he has gone into the "secret place," and bowed before God and talked with him, has he still felt that all was not well done. . He has pondered in muteness and asked why this heaviness. Yet just then at the instant when feeling most his "infirmities," he has heavily groaned, and the soul was somehow light and free. And "he that searcheth the hearts," the hearts of all his children, "knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit," the Holy Spirit as it dwells in them, "that it makes intercession for them" according to his will. Such is at least one of the ways in which the Spirit "helps" our "infirmities," though we are far from thinking it the only one.

We need the Holy Spirit, then, to strengthen us with might in the inner man; we need it to help our infirmities, we need it to intercede for us, we need it to groan within us, to groan when the brain has ceased to work save in stupor or delirium, to groan when the lip is stiff and the tongue still, to groan in life's last agony, to groan for the soul as it floats out with the last breath and spreads its wings for home—we need it then. O! deliver me from the cold material philosophy which denies that God has placed within me a comforter, a strengthener. I cling to the belief as I do to the shreds that knit my heart together.

IT IS DUE HIM.—I cannot repress the feeling of my heart to pay thus publicly a small tribute of respect to Brother J. YANCEY, of Hannibal, Missouri. Since the announcement to publish the Quarterly, scarcely a week has passed that has not brought a letter from his familiar hand with the money and a name for the same. For weeks at a time hardly a day can pass without the same token of the strong steady energy of this faithful man. "I am still digging away to get the brethren to take the Quarterly" is a characteristic sentence, and marks a man who works with a purpose and a will. In his praise there is nothing fulsome, in his hope no letting down, in his zeal no abatement. War news may buzz, and the Mississippi block, but on he steadily works. The mastiff may be choked from his hold, and a turtle is said to let go when it thunders, but it is marvelous to me if aught but death ever breaks the purpose of Brother J. Yancey when he feels himself to be right. All honor, say I, to his sterling modest worth.

HAVE WE NOT BECOME A SECT?

WHILE opposing sects and sect-making have we not ourselves become a sect? That we are so charged by the various parties of the day is a well known fact. But is the charge founded in truth? In the present article I shall attempt an answer to this question; but that this attempt may be attended with the better hope of success, it will be necessary to notice first the subject of sects generally.

The word sect is derived from the Latin *seco*, which signifies to cut; and the radical thought in both *cut* and *sece* is that of separating a thing into parts by cutting it. Hence the word sect necessarily implies a previous cutting; and the sect is one of the parts which results from the cutting. Now the thing cut is not itself a sect, unless it has resulted from a former cutting, which it may do; for clearly we may have a sect of a sect, as a cutting of a cutting. But with reference to its own parts the thing is never a sect. A sect, therefore, is a part of that which has been separated by cutting it. Such is the meaning of the term as deduced from etymology. But this is not necessarily its Scriptural meaning. Its Scriptural meaning is to be learned from the import of the word of which it is a translation. What the import of this word is will presently be shown.

In Greek we have three words which it will be important to notice, two of which are sometimes treated as corresponding with sect, though incorrectly so except in part. These are *αἵρεσις*, *διχοστασία*, and *αἵρεσις*—*scism*, *division*, and *heresy*.

Scism, or its Greek representative, is derived from a verb which signifies to split, rend, or tear apart; and the word scism denotes strictly the rent or split. Whether it ever denotes the parts rent or split off is questionable; and it is certain that it never denotes them in the New Testament.

The original of division, *διχοστασία*, literally means a standing apart, or separation. From this it easily comes to denote the things that stand apart; and in this sense is exactly equivalent to the word faction. It is in this sense alone that it occurs in the New Testament.

Heresy, in Greek, is derived from a verb which means primarily to take, as with the hand; and from this it comes to express taking with the mind; as when in an act of choice we take one thing in preference to another. It is in this latter sense only that the verb stands related to heresy. While therefore the word

heresy implies an act of choosing, it expresses only *the thing chosen*, and that *which results from it*, or grows out of it. This is strictly its acceptance in the New Testament.

Confining these terms now to bodies of men and women, and the distinction which exists among them may be at once pointed out. For this purpose let us suppose such a body to consist of a thousand members. This body is to be considered the genus or comprehending whole; in other words, it is not to be considered as a body of a larger body, a division of a larger division, but an absolute body. Let us now suppose this body to be divided into ten equal parts; and we are prepared to show the distinction among the terms.

The word scism refers both to the whole body and to its sub-divisions, and denotes strictly a rent or split in either of these. The word *διχοστασία*, *division*, signifies the *factions* formed by a split in the latter. It hence relates not to the whole body, but to factions in its sub-divisions.

The word heresy relates either to the whole body or to any one of its sub-divisions, but chiefly to the former; and denotes a party formed in it, but formed in a particular way. A person, for instance, in one of the sub-divisions, elects an idea foreign to the principles of the whole body, and introduces it into his own particular sub-division. Around this idea he proceeds to form a party. This party thus formed is now a heresy—a heresy both with reference to the particular sub-division in which it originated and to the whole body, but especially with reference to the latter. And this heresy is the true Scriptural sect. Whatever, then, may be the etymological import of the word sect, this is its Scriptural import; and in this sense, for the most part, we shall henceforward use it. Other distinctions existing between sect and faction will hereafter be pointed out. From the preceding the main or general distinctions can easily be collected.

From the foregoing it is evident that the words sect and faction express not absolute but relative ideas. Hence it is not every body of men and women that can be denominated a sect or faction. If a body be formed *ab initio* without reference to any other body it is not a sect, neither a faction. It is a sect or faction in so far only as it has been formed out of another body.

But since the words sect and faction are relative terms, the question arises, to what do they relate as the thing cut, rent, or divided—the thing out of which the sects and factions are formed. Of course no reference is here had to sects in politics or in philosophy, nor even in religion save the Christian. Hence the answer is that they refer exclusively to the body or church of Christ. This then is the thing cut, rent, or divided. How this is done,

and how sects and factions are formed out of it, I shall now proceed to show.

For this purpose I shall select a particular church or congregation, as the church at Corinth. To this church Paul thus writes: "Now I beseech you brethren by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no *divisions* among you." Divisions is not the word we should have here. The original is *σχίσματα*; hence we should have *scisms*. The passage would then read: "that there be no *scisms* among you." Here the word *scisms* denotes simply the rents or seams that existed between the various parties in the church. It has no immediate reference to the parties themselves—is no name for them—but merely marks the partition lines which separated them. The word which properly denotes the parties themselves, and which stands as a name for them, is *διχοστασία*, *divisions*, or *factions*; and we should prefer the latter. The word *divisions* is ambiguous, signifying both the separations or rents, as well as the parties separated; whereas the word *factions* denotes only the latter. It is hence preferable, and I shall therefore use it.

These parties consisted of little groups of persons in the church, united together by an undue attachment to certain eminent men who had been instrumental in their conversion or who had perhaps baptized them, such as Paul, Peter, and Apollos. These attachments were of the flesh and not of the Spirit; hence they marred the peace and affected the coherence of the church. They cooled its love, and thus became evil and divisive in their effects.

But be it particularly noticed, that although we here have both genuine *scisms* and genuine *factions*, we yet have no *sects*. Wrong and injurious as these *factions* were, still they were not *sects*. A chief element essential to *sects* was wanting in them, hence they were no *sects*. A *sect* is something marked with deeper stains of sin than marked these *factions*. Hence *scism* does not necessarily imply *sect*, though *sect* always implies *scism*. *Scism* may stop short of *sect*, implying only *faction*.

What then is the distinction between *faction*, *διχοστασία*, and *sect*, *αἵρεσις*? I answer, that *faction* implies a simple departure in *conduct* from the truth, and not a corruption of it, and is confined to single congregations; whereas *sect* implies both a *corruption* of the truth and a departure from it; and is not necessarily confined to single churches, though ordinarily originating in one. In *sect* the practical departure from the truth may be no greater than in *faction*, in which case the only distinction is, that in *sect* the truth is corrupted, in *faction*, not. *Faction* embraces all those little parties which spring up from time to time in individual congregations, and which owe their origin not to the corruption of

the truth, but to human weakness, or to some of the various manifestations thereof, as ignorance, prejudice, passion, and the like. I need hardly add, that faction may assume as many forms as the causes have which produce it. Sect, on the contrary, though it may assume like numerous forms, always originates in a single uniform cause, to-wit: the corruption of the truth. This corruption can be effected in only one or both of the two following ways:

1st. By importing into the church and incorporating with the truth some doctrine or tenet wholly untaught in the Bible. It is chiefly in this way that philosophy has contributed to the corruption of the truth. The sect-maker, who is the genuine Scriptural heretic, elects some doctrine in philosophy and introduces it into the church. Having mixed this with the truth, he next proceeds to form around it as a center his sect. Such is the first method of corrupting the truth and forming sects.

Now, for the sake of distinction, I shall denominate this foreign doctrine the *heresy*, but the party formed about it the sect. The word *heresy*, in the New Testament, as already stated, denotes both these, while the word *sect* denotes only the latter. Certainly it is not desirable to retain the word *heresy* in English in both these senses, nor to use both words in the same sense. Neither can we abandon the word *sect*. It is hence best to make the distinction I suggest.

But it may be well here to settle that the word *heresy* in the New Testament denotes this foreign doctrine. For this purpose I shall cite the following language from Peter: "There shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable *heresies*, even denying the Lord that bought them." That the word "*heresy*" here refers to false doctrines or opinions may be set down as certain. For, first, these *heresies* were something to be *brought into* the church. Now sects are not something first formed out of the church and then brought into it. On the contrary, they are formed in it and then go out of it. False doctrine alone, then, is the thing here named as that which was to be brought into the church. Second, that the clause, "denying the Lord," is a specification of one of the *heresies* to be brought in can hardly be questioned. I hence feel safe in denominating false doctrines introduced into the church *heresies*. And for the sake of another distinction I shall style this type of *heresy* intrusive *heresy*, because it is *intruded* into the church.

2d. By misconstruing the teachings of the Bible. For, clearly, a doctrine elicited by misconstruction of any portion of holy writ, provided it is really false, that is, is nowhere else sanctioned by the Bible, is as truly false doctrine and as pernicious in its effects as though it were wholly an importation. This form of

heresy I shall name constructive heresy, because it is introduced into the church by false constructions of the Scriptures. But no matter from what source the doctrine springs, the party formed about it is the same—a sect.

Now to one or the other or both of these two forms of heresy may be traced every sect in Christendom, now existing or that has existed. Of course it would be easy to distribute these two general forms into numerous specific sub-divisions; but I shall attempt nothing of the kind here, as it is not necessary to the end I have in view.

It is proper here to remark that it is not necessary for a party to be wholly corrupt in order to be a sect. A single false idea is enough, provided this is made the basis on which the party is formed. Indeed, it is universally thus that sects have their rise. Like men, they do not become corrupt all at once, if they ever do. It is not the policy of Satan to allow them to do so. The fewer the false doctrines, provided these really lead to the formation of a sect, the better for him. It is far easier for the man to delude himself with the belief that he will be saved, who holds ten truths and only one fatal error in consequence of which he has taken one fatal step, than it is for him who holds ten errors and only one truth; and as long as a man can persuade himself that he will be saved, he is not likely to abandon much that he holds. Indeed, the fatal error of sectarianism lies in this, that with the few false doctrines it holds, it still holds many that are true, and persuades itself that its few false doctrines will be overlooked in virtue of the true. Yet nothing can be more fallacious than this. For if a man knowingly holds one false doctrine, or one which with reasonable effort he might know to be false, and in consequence thereof takes a step so deeply criminal as that of becoming a sectarian, it is simply certain that he cannot be saved if he remains in this condition. He must abandon his doctrine, retrace his step, and repent of both, or he is lost.

Here perhaps it will be well to enlarge a little on the two kinds of heresy or false doctrine now named, and to point out how they become foundations on which to form sects.

Even, then, in the first century efforts began to be made to corrupt the pure teaching of the gospel. The sources from which the corrupting elements were chiefly drawn were the oriental and western philosophies then in vogue. Gnostic and other notions respecting the character of God, the origin of evil, the government of the world, the nature of Christ, the nature of the human soul, and a future state, thus early began to infest the church, and to be used as grounds on which to rear sects. These notions being something wholly unknown to the Bible, were clear instances of

intrusive heresy. Around them Christians in their weakness and corruption rallied; and thus laid the foundation for those dreadful defections which have ever since disgraced the Christian profession.

To the foregoing is to be added a very different class of notions derived from the Mosaic writings and held as necessary to salvation. These notions were the first to corrupt the pure teaching of Christ. They were either retained or adopted by large bodies of the early converts from among the Jews, and were made by them the bases on which arose the numerous Judaizing sects who gave the early churches so much trouble. They formed another instance of intrusive heresy, and greatly corrupted the truth of Christ.

To these two classes is still to be added a third class, compounded of heathen superstitions, Gnostic notions, and Jewish teachings, and constituting the huge mass of Papal traditions. Of all the intrusive heresies with which the church has ever been cursed, these have formed the most injurious and disgraceful. They are still the life and food of modern sects.

Constructive heresy arises from so interpreting the holy Scriptures as to make them mean either too much or too little, or something entirely different from their true meaning, and in some instances even from denying them outright.

1st. For illustration, let us suppose the thing taught to be that Christ has come in the flesh. Not only is this denied, but since it is admitted that he has come in some form, it is maintained that he has come not in the flesh. We here have two positions; one affirmed in the Bible but denied, and another proposed in its stead. The choice lies between these two, and the heretic takes the latter; takes it, as in the case of the Gnostics, on the ground that human flesh is essentially evil, and that, therefore, Christ cannot have come in it. This lie is now made the center around which a sect begins to be formed, and so the work goes on. This form of heresy might more aptly be denominated negative than constructive; but it is best not to multiply classes where it is not absolutely necessary.

2d. Let the thing taught be the qualifications necessary to entitle a person to baptism. Construing the Scriptures on this point to mean too much, and we have the ancient doctrine respecting catechumens, and the modern heresy of getting religion, and relating experiences.

3d. Let the thing taught be regeneration. Construing the Scriptures here to mean too little, and there results the delusion that regeneration consists exclusively in an internal change or change of heart.

4th. Let the thing taught be the unity of the church. Construing the Scriptures on this point to mean something entirely different from their true meaning, and we have the doctrine of a plurality of churches or of a plurality of branches of the same church.

Other illustrations will readily occur to the intelligent reader; for they are innumerable. The foregoing are suggested as mere samples, and are enough for our purpose.

But here an important question arises, to-wit: are sects confined wholly within the limits of the church, or do they ever exist without it? That the latter is the popular view as well as the popular understanding of the term, I do not think worth while attempting to prove. Even those who admit that there may be sects within the church, still insist that there are many wholly without it; while of course those who deny that any sects are within it, hold that all sects are without it. Now I take the position that both these parties are wrong; and *that sects exist not without the church but wholly within it*. Nor am I here using the word church in a loose popular sense, but in its strict Scriptural sense, or as equivalent to the phrase, the body of Christ. On this apparently singular position I beg the reader to suspend his judgment and hear me patiently.

The word sect, or heresy in the sense of sect, does not occur in the Old Testament at all, nor in the first four books of the New. In Acts it occurs six times. In four of these it clearly refers to parties recognized or treated as sections of the great Jewish family, and in no sense as separate and distinct from it. Nor is there any just ground for regarding it as having a different reference in the other two instances. That the sect of the Nazarenes, spoken of by Tertullus in his prosecution of Paul before Felix, was deemed by him simply a new sect among the Jews, hardly admits of a doubt. And it is simply certain that Paul in his defense reiterates the term in the same sense in which Tertullus had used it. From its usage, therefore, in this book, it appears to apply strictly to parties in the Jewish family; and to parties regarded as still in it and of it, and not separate from it.

The same is true of the term when applied to parties in the church. It denotes such only as are within it, and never such as are without it. "For there must," says Paul in writing to the Corinthians, "be also heresies [sects] among you, that they who are approved may be made manifest." Where, according to this, were these sects to make their appearance? "*Among you*," is the reply; that is, among you Christians or in the church. Again, in enumerating the works of the flesh the same apostle mentions, amongst other things, "strife, seditions, *heresies*," or *sects*. And

clearly he is here speaking of evils which existed and might exist in the church, and not such as existed *without* it, and had no connection with it. Finally, the heretic or sect-maker, after a first and second admonition, is to be rejected. But where is he at the time of receiving these admonitions? Certainly in the church in which he is engaged in creating his sect. But these are all the instances of the use of the term in the New Testament except one, where it denotes, as clearly shown, not sects but false doctrines. Sects I therefore conclude are something confined strictly within the limits of the church.

But let no one suppose, because these sects originate and exist in the church, that they are, therefore, right, or that they are to be tolerated in it. Such supposition would be grossly false. That sects are wrong, nay essentially evil and wicked, may be conclusively argued from two considerations. 1st. Those who create them "shall not inherit the kingdom of God." Such at least is an apostle's decision. 2d. Sects cannot be right and making sects be wrong. Yet Paul directs that he who makes them shall be rejected, and clearly because he is an evil-doer. We may hence conclude them to be essentially sinful.

But suppose a sect to be once formed in the church, but ultimately to become separated from it, no matter whether by its own voluntary act in withdrawing, or by the act of the church in expelling it, what then is it? Is it still a sect? No. It is no longer a sect. The instant it passes beyond the pale of the church it ceases to be a sect. *It is now an apostasy.* In the church it existed only as a sect; out of the church it exists only as an apostasy. Such is clearly the distinction between sect and apostasy. While in the church it is a *αἵρεσις*, a little party holding a false tenet, with merely a rent or seam between it and the rest of the church, but not yet completely separated from it. Now, however, it is an *αποστασία*, the same corrupted party standing wholly off from the church, completely severed from it, and having no connection whatever with it.

Let this offstanding body now go on increasing in size, collecting members from every available source, until its proportions have become so vast as to cover whole districts of country, and even to pervade whole kingdoms. Now appoint to this body a head, an ecclesiastic and civil head, one who claims the power, *jure divino*, to govern kings, and to alter at will "laws" in the church of Christ, and we have "the Man of Sin," the Papacy, or great apostasy foretold in the Bible. Let factions now arise in this body and ultimately separate from it. In these again let other factions arise and finally separate from them. In other words, let us have apostasies from *the* apostasy, and apostasies

from these again, without any complete return to the church of Christ, and we have the various parties now in Christendom complacently styling themselves "*Christian sects*," such as Episcopalians, Methodists, Presbyterians, etc. These parties were not originally apostasies from the church of Christ, but apostasies from the Papacy or from other apostasies therefrom, and constitute the harlot daughters of old Mother Rome. Their harlotry consists in this, that they carry on an illicit intercourse with the world in the institution of infant sprinkling, and thereby introduce into the so-called church a breed of bastard children, born after the flesh and not after the Spirit. That these parties are better than the parent stock in most respects is gladly granted; but that they still fall far short of the church of Christ is certain. But of all the perversions of language known to me, none is greater than to call these parties *Christian sects*. They are sects in no sense of the word save a false sense, but apostasies in a double sense. They are apostasies both from Rome and from Christ. In that we praise them, in this condemn them. It is hence an abuse of the word to call them sects, and a prostitution of the name of Christ to call them Christian. To call them Christian sects makes them appear not merely harmless things, but most attractive. Had they been branded as God has branded them, with the deeply opprobrious epithet of harlot daughters of Rome or apostasies, the world would never have been gulled by them as it has been.

It is proper here to remark that a whole congregation or individual church may become an apostasy precisely as a sect in some particular congregation becomes one; that is, by adopting some foreign doctrine and conforming thereto. The only distinction is that this church, as soon as it adopts and conforms to the corrupting doctrine, becomes a sect in, and with reference to, the *whole* church, and not first in some particular congregation thereof; and that as soon as it proceeds so far that, were it a part of some particular church, it would have to be expelled, then it is to be deemed a genuine apostasy.

But when we speak of a particular denomination, or of a particular church, as an apostasy, be it borne in mind that we speak strictly of the party as such, or the organized body, and not of all the individual members thereof. Even in apostasies we may have individual Christians; and these, since they resist the corruptions of the apostasy and keep themselves free from it, are not to be condemned with it. Such individual Christians are commanded in the Bible to come out of these corrupt bodies; and if they fail to heed this command, they may go down to ruin with the party they refuse to abandon.

As hypocrites ordinarily affect a deeper piety than even the purest Christians, so "Christian sects" affect the profoundest reverence for the truth which they corrupt. There is, however, no enemy so much to be feared as he who, while pretending to be your friend, thrusts his dagger to your heart. And so with these "sects." The cause of Christ has no other enemies it has so much reason to fear. They affect the highest veneration for the Bible; yet they make creeds. Now the party that does this publishes to the world, if no more, at least four things:

1st. That the Bible is an insufficient rule of government for the church. For if it were sufficient, no creed would be needed for that purpose.

2d. That the Bible is an unsafe guardian of the truth. For if it were not, the truth might safely be left to its keeping.

3d. That the creed is a safer guide in some things than the Bible. For if not, the Bible might be left to guide in all things without the creed.

4th. That human wisdom is better than Divine. For that has produced the creed, this the Bible; and the creed is, for some purposes, better than the Bible; for if the Bible be for all purposes better than the creed, then none but a fool can accept the creed for any purpose.

Can "Christian sects" be friends of the Bible when they publish of it such things as these to the world? That they are its friends in many respects I shall not deny; but that in many others they are its enemies I am painfully certain. They acknowledge themselves to be "sects," yet they cannot but know that the Bible condemns them in this. How then can they be truly its friends, when in the face of its authority they knowingly persist in making and being what it condemns?

In regard to apostasies, or "Christian sects," one of two positions must be taken. Either that they are all wrong but one, and it is right; or that they are all wrong in some things, and right in some. The former position is out of the question; for the very fact that a party exists confessedly as a "sect," to say nothing of apostasy, determines it to be wrong. The latter position, then, alone is tenable. Now if these "sects" be wrong in some things and right in some, in which things are they wrong? Can any creed in Christendom, or all of them together, answer this? Clearly not; and this proves how worthless they are. Neither can it be answered by comparing one party with another party; nor by comparing one individual of one party with another individual of a different party. Suppose, then, we agree to compare all with the infallible standard of Christianity.

Is a genuine Methodist, then, a true Christian? It would cer-

tainly give offense were I to deny it. Be it so, then, at least for the present. But is a genuine Baptist also a true Christian? Let this too be granted. A genuine Methodist, then, is a true Christian; and a genuine Baptist is a true Christian. Now certainly things which are equal to the same third are equal to one another. Therefore a genuine Baptist is a true Methodist; and a genuine Methodist a true Baptist. Now this conclusion we know to be false; yet it could not be false were a genuine Baptist a true Christian neither more nor less, and a genuine Methodist the same.

But let us suppose that a genuine Baptist is more than a true Christian; that is, that he holds to more doctrines, and more practices, than are essential to constitute a true Christian. Even he himself will acknowledge the excess to be wrong. But where does he learn that it is wrong? Certainly not from his creed; for his creed determines him to be simply a true Christian and not more. He learns it from the Bible. Here, then, in a most vital point, he learns from the Bible what he cannot learn from the creed; and this establishes both a difference between them, and that the creed is defective. Of course the same train of reasoning, with a simple change of terms, applies to him supposing him to be less than a Christian. The same is also true of the Methodist. From all of which it follows that the Bible is, after all, the only infallible source from which we can learn what a true Christian is, as well as the only infallible test of what it takes to constitute one.

But I am anxious to so curtail or add to both this Methodist and Baptist that each shall be neither more nor less than a simple Christian. For this purpose I propose to extinguish the differences which exist between them; and the first which I propose thus to dispose of is their creeds, and all that they have learned exclusively from them. Few persons, I am persuaded, will demur to this on the score that I have marred anything really Christian in these men. The next difference which I propose to extinguish is their names. For if both of these men be true Christians neither more nor less, evidently there cannot exist between them even a nominal, to say nothing of a real difference. I next propose to cancel their connection with their respective parties. For were they one in all other respects, belonging to two different parties would itself make a difference. Consequently they are now, be it supposed, Christians strictly according to the Bible; that is, they mentally accept and in heart hold, as the matter of their faith, precisely and only what the Bible certainly teaches; they do and practice what, and only what, it either expressly or by precedent enjoins; in spirit, temper, and disposition, they are exactly what it requires; and as to names, they wear none save those

which it imposes. With no infallible test of Christianity, can they now be compared so as to warrant either a false or an absurd conclusion.

I therefore conclude that the position now occupied by these two men is the true position for all Christian men to occupy.

But did all Christian men occupy this position, what would be the result? 1st. We should have no creeds, no parties, no party names; and that we owe it to God to have none I infer from this: that the Bible authorizes neither a creed, nor a party, nor a party name. 2d. We should have no difference in the matter of faith, none in practice, but a simple, faultless conformity to the will of God, and consequently the most perfect union of which we can conceive. Now when we reflect on the results which would follow a consummation like this, how is it that any pure heart can ever cease to pray for it, or any truly good man ever decline to work for it. If they ever do cease to pray or decline to work for it, then I confess this question unanswerable.

But we are told that all Christians cannot see alike; and that consequently the existence of "Christian sects" is unavoidable. This, then, is a plea for these "sects," a plea based on the ground of necessity. Now we shall certainly not deny that we ought to have "sects," provided they are really necessary. Let us therefore examine a little the ground on which this plea rests.

Is it true, then, that all Christians *cannot* see alike? It is a humiliating fact, I grant, that they *will not* see alike, but a grand lie that they cannot. Paul would never have besought his brethren to be "perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment," if it is impossible for Christians to see alike. Neither would he have entreated them to "speak the same thing," if they cannot see alike; for seeing alike is the basis of speaking alike. Nor would Christ have prayed that all his disciples "might be one," as he and the Father are one, if Christians must see differently. I therefore decide that all Christians *can see alike*; and what they can do they are solemnly obliged to do.

Three things, and only three, are necessary to seeing alike. 1st. That we look at the same thing. For if one man looks at the sun and another at an iron spike, it is very certain they will not see alike. 2d. That we look through the same medium or same degree of light. For what is merely a tombstone to one man in broad daylight, is a ghost to another at night. 3d. That we all look from the same stand-point. For if a Baptist should look at the moon from the door of a Baptist church, and a Presbyterian look at it from the door of a Presbyterian church, to the former the man on the moon would be immersing, but to the latter sprinkling. These three things attended to and all Chris-

tians can see alike, *provided they are willing*. And if they be not willing, the question is settled on a very different basis from that of necessity; for what men will not do in a case like this, will very certainly never be done.

But we have another plea for these parties, namely, that they are a good thing, since they watch over each other with a jealous eye, and thereby keep each other within safer bounds; and that besides, one by its jealous regard for the word of God prevents another from corrupting it. Had it been said that they watch over each other with a hellish eye, that they drive each other to the greatest extremes, and that each perverts the word of God in attempting to defend its own extreme positions against the rest—this would have been much nearer the truth. That the Popish heresy of justification by works alone begat the Lutheran heresy of justification by faith alone, cannot be denied by any intelligent reader of history; and that the parties holding these respective views ever exerted over each other any beneficial effect by their jealous watchings, would, I am persuaded, be hard to prove. Nothing can be more remote from the truth than to suppose that men mutually guard each other by differing, especially in the spirit in which one religious partisan differs from another; and that one prevents another from corrupting the truth by driving him to defend extreme positions. No defense, therefore, for “Christian sects,” can be deduced from these premises.

But we have still another plea for “Christian sects,” to-wit: that they afford each man, on his making a profession of religion, an opportunity of *choosing where he shall live*. I frankly grant it; but are they justifiable on this ground? At this period of his life a man's Scriptural knowledge may well be regarded as ordinarily very defective, his former prejudices as not wholly overcome, his old carnal attachments as not yet completely subdued, nor his previous errors as entirely corrected. At no time in his life is he more ill qualified to make a choice than now, especially one seriously affecting the eternal interests of his soul. Yet, according to the present plea, it is a good thing to afford him an opportunity just now of making a choice among a score of warring “sects.” Nothing can be more unsound than such a position. On the contrary, we say hem him in between the alternatives of accepting the church of Christ or rejecting it, and you immeasurably diminish his chances of erring. This is our position as a people, the former that of the various parties of the day. Reader, what sayest thou?

We have now for some time been designating the various denominations of the day as parties simply, or in their own style,

as "Christian sects." But these titles present them in far too inoffensive a light. Parties they certainly are; but they are something worse than mere parties. *They are apostasies.* Let no one, then, conceive of them under the comparatively innocent notion of parties, but view them in their true light as apostasies. This is painful I grant, and can afford no pleasure to any truly benevolent heart; but stern justice demands it. Against the individual members of these parties we cannot have even one unkind feeling. Many of them we regard as true Christians, and love them sincerely. But as long as they occupy a place in bodies holding traditional and other unsanctioned tenets; holding practices unknown to the Bible, and sporting humanly imposed names, we must tell them plainly that they stand on apostate ground. We could wish a thousand times it were otherwise; but vain are even the purest wishes here. When heresy once takes full possession of a man, his soul heeds neither the warning of God nor the entreaty of men. Obstinate and eccentric then are all its ways.

But as yet the question standing at the head of this article remains unanswered, to-wit: Have we not become a "sect?" In the light of the premises now before us it will not be difficult to reply to this question; but without these premises our reply must necessarily have been confused and unsatisfactory.

First, then, I inquire into our original *intention* in regard to the point raised by the question, did we at the first *intend* to form a "sect?" With emphasis I answer we did not. On no page of Mr. Campbell's, Mr. Stone's, Mr. Scott's, nor in any tract, pamphlet, periodical, or speech, written or unwritten, of ours, has such a thought ever found utterance. On the contrary, our original intention was absolutely neither to form a new sect (taking this term in its popular acceptation), nor by word or deed to aid the upbuilding of any one already formed. From the very commencement of our labors we set our faces with deadly hostility against every conceivable form of sectarianism. We eschewed the thing with our whole hearts; and never by look or word or deed, from that day to this, has it had any countenance from us. If, therefore, we have formed a "sect," it has been at least unintentionally done. Hence we are to be acquitted of any criminal intentions in the case.

Second. But did we not originally intend merely to *modify* or *reconstruct* some existing "sect," and thereby virtually form one? I again answer with an emphatic denial. A "sect" reconstructed would still be a "sect;" and we were opposed to "sects" in every conceivable shape or form. And what in this case we did not intend to do, it is absolutely certain we have not done. We are

therefore no modified or reconstructed "sect." The history of the world will, I believe, justify the remark that "sects" never grow better by reconstruction. There is but one remedy for "sects;" and that is complete extinction.

Third. What then was our original intention? This I shall leave to be learned from our origin. But what was that? Certainly it was not denominational. We did not originate as a party either original or reconstructed. On the contrary, our origin was purely individual; that is, we commenced with a few persons in an individual, and not in an associated or organic capacity. But when I say *our origin*, let me not be misunderstood. The language is not strictly correct, and may lead to a false inference. I am using it as the language of the world, and to express a conception of the world. We, i. e., our brotherhood, appear before the world as a "sect," having a determinate origin in time and manner like other "sects," and as distinguished from them precisely as one "sect" is distinguished from another. The language, therefore, relates to what seems to the world as our origin, and not to an origin *per se*, or to any thing we would designate as such. We do not admit that we are a "sect," hence of course we deny a sectarian origin. This is as explicit as I can well be just here.

Fourth. But how, strictly, did we take our origin, and in what did it consist? It is more particularly in replying to this inquiry that I shall furnish an answer to the question, have we not become a sect? We took our origin then as follows:

One or two pious men determined that they would closely and prayerfully study the Bible, but especially the New Testament, for the purpose of determining precisely, first, what it teaches as the matter of faith; and, second, what it enjoins as the matter of duty necessary to a man's becoming a Christian. By this course they were led to a minute analysis, in the light of this book, of their own existing religious views and feelings. These they ultimately distributed into two classes. 1. Such as the New Testament indisputably sanctioned. 2. Such as it indisputably did not sanction. These latter were utterly and forever discarded. Mid-way between these two classes lay a third class which it was not indubitable that the New Testament did or did not teach. This class it was agreed to hold for the time being *sub judice* as mere *opinions*, but in no case to make them tests of soundness either in the matter of faith, or in that of duty.

Having thus settled what is the matter of faith and the matter of duty necessary to becoming a Christian, their next step was, in the spirit and temper prescribed by the Master, to conform exactly to this matter, and that, too, without even the slightest

regard to what they had previously been or done, or to any existing church or denominational connection. Indeed, they had already, by their own deliberate resolution, sundered every tie which bound them to any existing party or sect as such. In heart they were conscious of a sincere faith in Jesus Christ as the son of God, and of a pure love of him. In regard to past sins they were cordially sorry for them, and, as far as they had not already done so (for they professed to be Christian men), resolved to forsake them. In this frame of mind they publicly professed with their lips the faith of their hearts, and thereon were immersed in the name of the Lord. If not now saved, if not Christians, on what ground can we ever vindicate as true the solemn asseveration of Christ, that "he that believeth and is immersed shall be saved?" Thus we had our origin.

But clearly this was not the origin of a "sect" or of a party as such, *but simply instances of a few men becoming Christians*. And it would be just as appropriate to term each instance of a man becoming a Christian the origin of a "sect," as to term these instances our origin. Yet so novel a thing was it in those days for men to become Christians strictly according to the New Testament, and that alone, that these few instances were thought to mark a new era in the history of the church. Hence to them the world has agreed to affix the epithet *our origin*; and it is in this accommodated sense that we have used it. The work thus commenced went on till half a score or more of persons became obedient to the faith. These now met and formed themselves into a church after the primitive model as laid down in the New Testament. And now, in the present day, we as a people consist of individuals who have thus obeyed the Saviour, and of communities or churches organized after the same ancient type. But we are not yet ready for a decision of the question, have we not become a sect?

We are sometimes termed Reformers, and the work in which we are engaged the Reformation, and sometimes in an accommodated sense we thus term ourselves and our work. What does the language mean? I have long been convinced that it carries a false import. The word Reformers, as applied to us, means simply a new kind of sectarians, and the word Reformation the work and principles of a new sect. But this is far from the sense in which we use them. In what sense, then, if at all, are we reformers? Certainly not in this, that we propose merely to reform existing so called sects and parties. When reformed, they would still fall immeasurably below the work we wish to see effected. This work done, and we should have neither sects nor sectarians, but only the church of Christ and Christians. Neither are we

reformers in the sense of being a new sect, because we propose to reform the world. For though we do this, it is no reason why we should be thought a new sect. Were the apostles still alive they could propose no less; yet this would not justify us in terming them sectarians. In one view only can we be deemed Reformers, namely, if a Christian man holds erroneous tenets and practices, we require him to abandon the one and correct the other. But he who does simply this can in no legitimate sense be termed a sectarian! But if a man belongs to the world, what we require is, that he shall become simply a Christian; and if he belongs to a sect, but is not a Christian, we treat him precisely as though he belonged to the world; that is, we ignore wholly his sectarian connections, character, tenets, and practices, and require him to become simply a Christian. Consequently there is nothing in our being reformers as now explained to mark us as a sect.

I doubt not the word Reformers was first applied to us because it was supposed that we intended merely to reform the Baptist denomination, with which many of our brethren originally stood connected; but we never proposed to reform that denomination. The reformation we proposed looked solely to individual Christians and not to denominations. Many Baptists we then regarded, and still regard as sincere Christians, but as in error in several things. In these things we proposed a reformation; but at the same time we required an abandonment of all party connections, names, and peculiarities. We proposed that the Baptists should be Christians simply, and should cease to be Baptists; and that they should belong to the church of Christ only, and not to the Baptist denomination. In only a very restricted sense, therefore, can we be termed reformers; and that a sense which in no respect distinguishes us from the simplest and purest type of Christians.

The Reformation of Luther was a reformation in the strictest sense of the word. What he proposed, at first at least, was merely to reform the Roman apostasy. An effort to build up the church of Christ, as something wholly distinct from the Papacy, was a thought that did not enter his brain. But in this sense we are not Reformers, neither is the work in which we are engaged a Reformation. Indeed, our work is strictly a *Formation* and not a *Re-formation*. We are laboring solely to build up the church of Christ, and neither to build nor rebuild, form nor reform, any thing different from it.

Still, though such was our original intention, and such the work we proposed, have we not, nevertheless, become a sect? If so, it must have been in one or both of the two ways previously laid down.

First, then, have we introduced into the church any foreign

element or doctrine unsanctioned by the Bible; and are we endeavoring to form around this a party? If so, I shall only say that forty years watching and labor upon the part of our opponents who have lacked neither ability nor industry, have been wholly insufficient either to detect that element, or to point out even the shadow of that party. And I feel safe in concluding that had either existed it would long since have been shown. To the charge, therefore, of Intrusive heresy I plead, in the name of my brethren, not guilty.

Second. But cannot the charge of Constructive heresy be made good against us? In other words, have we not been guilty of construing the word of God to mean either too much or too little, or something which is not in it, and are we not forming a party about this error? I reply to this as to the previous charge. We have certainly intended nothing of the kind; and if we have done it by accident, our opponents have lacked neither the inclination nor the ability to expose us. Yet they have not done it; sound criticism, enlightened reason, and honesty being judges. Hence to this second count we also plead not guilty.

Finally, we accept as the matter of our faith precisely and only what the Bible teaches, rejecting everything else; and in our practice endeavor to conform strictly to what it, and it alone, enjoins either in precept or in precedent. In life and heart we aim to be all and purely what it requires. We wear no name which it does not sanction; and repudiate all sects, parties, and apostasies, as well as any and every conceivable form of connection with them. If, then, we are still a sect, I submit it to the candid reader, whether, upon any ground known to him, he can acquit the apostles and primitive Christians of that offensive charge?

MY REVIEW OF MR. JETER.—I am frequently receiving inquiries in regard to this work. To all who may want it, I take this method of saying that I have about two hundred copies on hand, which it is certainly to my interest to sell. They are doing no good in my hands; they might do good if in the hands of others. I shall be sincerely thankful to the brethren if they will aid me to dispose of them. To any one who will send me one dollar, I will send a copy of the work, post paid.

M. E. L.

CRITICISM OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

1.

THEY departed Barnabas to Tarsus, to seek Saul: and when he had found him, he brought him to Antioch. And it came to pass, that a whole year they assembled themselves with the church, and taught much people. And the disciples were called Christians first in Antioch. Acts xi: 25-26.

The question here is, by whom were the disciples first called Christians—by Paul and Barnabas or by others? If by Paul and Barnabas, then it is contended that the name had a divine origin; but if by others, then that it had not. The question I think a deeply serious one—one entitled to a searching examination. But even allowing that Paul and Barnabas gave the name, would it thence result that it had a divine origin? Not necessarily. If they gave the name while in the due performance of their duties as inspired men, then certainly it had a divine origin; but if they gave it merely in discretion or simply as men, then it had not. Which alternative is the more probable? The former I have no hesitation in granting. Still I grant it not because I feel it to be absolutely certain, but because I think it decidedly the more probable. Our late lamented Brother Shannon maintained that the very word employed to express the act, *χρηματίζειν*, implies that the act was performed at the suggestion of the Holy Spirit. His judgment, which his abilities enabled him to render certainly plausible, I always sincerely respected, but still I think it was wrong. I have not his thoughts in the case at hand, or I should have pleasure in doing his memory the justice to insert them. The mere use of *χρηματίζειν* does not, in my judgment, warrant the conclusion that the name had a divine origin, even allowing that Paul and Barnabas used the word. Still if they used the word or gave the name, I shall not deny to it a divine origin; although I shall not concede to it one as a matter of necessity. That Paul and Barnabas gave the name I most firmly believe, my only doubt being whether they gave it of their own accord or by direction of the Spirit. I wish I saw in the passage the circumstances which could fully remove the doubt, but I do not. If others fancy they do, with them certainly I shall have no quarrel. *Who then gave the name?* In order to elicit an answer to this question, which shall be in any high degree satisfactory, the most cautious procedure is necessary. Not a fact or circumstance must be omitted which can afford us the least aid. Our premises must be soundly laid—our conclusions justly drawn. Then and only then can we have confidence in the result. If the investigation con-

sume time and occupy space, its importance will be its best apology. As, then, inaugurating the work before us, we submit the following rendering of the passage, which we shall at once proceed to defend, namely :

Then Barnabas went to Tarsus to seek Saul; and finding him, he brought him to Antioch. And it happened that for a whole year they were brought together in the church, and taught a large crowd, and called the disciples Christians first in Antioch.

They were brought together in the church—*αὐτοὺς συναχθῆναι ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ*. That *αὐτοὺς* is the subject of the verb *συναχθῆναι*, and refers to Saul and Barnabas as its antecedents, admits of no doubt. That *συναχθῆναι* is the infinitive, and passive, is equally clear. *ἄγω* means primarily to lead, to bring—*συνάγω* to lead together, to bring together. And as no obvious necessity exists in the present case demanding a departure from this primary sense, *αὐτοὺς συναχθῆναι* should, therefore, be rendered, as the verb is passive, *they were brought together*—this implying that they came together in the church, not of their own accord or own will, but that they *were brought together* in it by the Holy Spirit, which was in them and directing them. We think it clear that the passive form should be retained in English as implying this fact.

Next that the same *αὐτοὺς*, referring to the same antecedents, is the subject of *διδάξαι* is certain. *Διδάξαι* is the infinitive, and active: *αὐτοὺς διδάξαι* should, therefore, be rendered—*they taught*. To render these words *they were taught*, meaning thereby that Saul and Barnabas were taught, would be not merely to violate needlessly the form of the original, but to utter a falsehood. Such a rendering could never be sustained. Not that we are slavishly to conform to mere verbal forms of the Greek where no reason exists for it; but that we must not set these forms aside or disregard them without reason. Such is sometimes the case, as is well known to every scholar: but the procedure must not be arbitrary, especially when an issue of great importance depends on it, as in the case now in hand.

But is this same *αὐτοὺς* the subject of *χρηματίζαι*? Most critics, it is but just to say, seem to doubt whether the answer should be yes or no. A dubious this or dubious that is all the reply we can get from most of them. If this noncommittalism proceeded from mere caution we should certainly admire it; but we have reason to fear that in many instances it springs from indifference, or from the erroneous persuasion that the matter involved is of no moment. Even Brother Campbell, ordinarily so bold in the affirmation and defense of the truth, has, in the very work in which of all others he should have favored us with a masterly criticism in the premises—his Revision of Acts—passed the subject in

injurious silence. A short paragraph of a few commonplace remarks is all he has on it. Nothing better can be said of Dr. Hackett. His work, so judicious and creditable to his candor in many places, is certainly deficient here. Nor has even Brother McGarvey, in his Commentary, recently from the press, grappled with the subject as we had reason to hope he would. We regret this. Brother M. is not the man to shrink from a responsibility. Besides, he possesses many of the qualifications so essential to the production of a sound criticism. We wish he had subjected the point in issue to a severe investigation. True, he says the question "would require more verbal criticism than is suited to the design of his work." Yet we should greatly have preferred that criticism to the apology we have in its stead. No extent of criticism could be pronounced too much which should serve to settle the matter in dispute.

But is *αὐτοῦς* the subject of *χρηματίζει*? Let us suppose for a moment that it is not. That the verb has a personal subject in the accusative cannot be denied. Who then or what is it?

1. It cannot be *τοῦτον*, the ordinary relative when the relation is near, referring to *δχλον* as its antecedent. For if so, the connection of thought, and especially the change from the subject of the preceding verb, required that the relative should be expressed and not be left to be supplied. For if left to be supplied, then is the reader in constant danger of supplying the wrong instead of the right subject. This becomes apparent from the following renderings, which I shall make very full in order clearly to indicate this danger: And it happened that for a whole year they (Saul and Barnabas) were brought together in the church, and that they taught a great crowd, and that they called the disciples Christians first in Antioch. That this is the rendering which first and chiefly strikes the mind both of him who is best and of him who is least acquainted with the sacred text, seems to me intuitively certain. Yet if *τοῦτον* be the subject of *χρηματίζει*, this rendering is not only not correct, but false and delusive. The following then is the rendering: And it happened that for a whole year they (Saul and Barnabas) were brought together in the church, and that they taught a great crowd, and that *it* (*τοῦτον*—the crowd) called the disciples Christians first in Antioch. *Τοῦτον* consequently cannot be the subject.

2. Neither can *αὐτόν* in the singular, and having the same reference, be the subject. For then the change from the plural subject of *διδάξει* to a singular one of *χρηματίζει* clearly required that the singular should be expressed. Otherwise confusion and irremovable uncertainty must inevitably result.

3. But may not the subject of *χρηματίζει* be some implied rela-

tive referring not to the crowd, but to *people generally* as its antecedent; and may not the meaning of the passage be this: That for a whole year Saul and Barnabas were brought together in the church, and that they taught a great crowd, and that *the people* called the disciples Christians first in Antioch? If so, I reply, the fact can never be shown; and it certainly must not be assumed. Clear it is that the form of the original does not indicate it. The only form which could imply a subject referring to people is the passive infinitive *χρηματισθῆναι*. And even here the reference might be to Saul and Barnabas, and not to the people. A certain reference to the latter could never be established. Hence an implied subject referring to people cannot be admitted.

4. There remains only one more possible alternative to be considered, namely, may not *μαθητὰς* be the subject of *χρηματίζειν*? If so, the following is the true rendering of the passage: And it happened that for a whole year they (Saul and Barnabas) were brought together in the church, and that they taught a great crowd, and that *the disciples called themselves* Christians first in Antioch. But this rendering can never be defended by the present text. It is clearly unnatural and false. In order to justify it, the text should contain either *χρηματίζασθαι*, the infinitive of the middle, or the reflexive *ἑαυτοῦς*. If the former were used the latter might be omitted; but omitting the former and using the active, *χρηματίζειν*, and the presence of the latter becomes imperative. Now since we have neither the infinitive of the middle, nor the reflexive—the only two forms which could justify the rendering now in hand—I hence conclude the rendering to be false.

From all of which I conclude that the subject of *χρηματίζειν* cannot be some implied relative referring to *ἔχλον*, the crowd; nor one referring to people, meaning thereby the people generally; nor yet can it be *μαθητὰς*. Hence it must be *αὐτοῦς* referring to Saul and Barnabas, since there remains no other either expressed or implied. That *αὐτοῦς* is the subject of *συναχθῆναι* is indisputable; that it is also the subject of *διδάξαι* is equally certain; nor is it a whit less so that it is the subject of *χρηματίζειν*. Hence they who were brought together were they that taught, and they who taught were they that called the disciples Christians first in Antioch, and these were Saul and Barnabas. My rendering is therefore sustained.

Further, that *χρηματίζω* has its regular active and regular passive voice, and that it is found in both these in the New Testament, is a simple well known fact incapable of being denied. Now that the Holy Spirit had a reason for using the one of these instead of the other, where it has used either, will not be questioned. In the passage in hand it has used the active. It then had a reason for

it—what was it? Had it used the passive, it must have remained forever uncertain whether the disciples were called Christians first by Saul and Barnabas or by others: using the active, all is clear—Saul and Barnabas certainly gave the name. Is not this then the reason for using the active?

But how shall this active be rendered into English? Passively says Brother Campbell—passively says Dr. Hackett—passively says Brother McGarvey. Are these authors right? We think not. Why if the passive form is necessary in English, and if the subject of the infinitive is to be left uncertain—why, we repeat, was not the corresponding form used in Greek and a corresponding uncertainty thereby created? This is a tough question for those that render passively. They will never answer it.

Nothing can be more whimsical than the common version of these forms, which has tyrannized over the English mind so long, and which we all feel it so very difficult to get rid of. *Συναχθῆναι*, which is passive, it renders as an active, or rather, as a middle. *Χρηματίσαι*, which is active, it renders as a passive, while *διδάξαι* alone is rendered correctly. Now if the voice is to be regarded in one of these cases, for consistency's sake let it be regarded in all, unless some stern reason exists for the contrary. And let it not be assumed that such reason exists, but, if such be the fact, let it be shown. This, however, can never be done. Clearly the voice of all these verbs should be scrupulously retained in English.

Consequently since *αὐτοὺς* is the subject of *χρηματίσαι*, and since *χρηματίσαι* is active, and therefore should be rendered actively, unless some stubborn necessity forbids, or the case is purely indifferent—and neither that nor this is true in the present instance, I hence infer the true rendering of the passage to be as already given, namely: And it happened that for a whole year they, Saul and Barnabas, were brought together in the church, and that they taught a great crowd, and that they called the disciples Christians first in Antioch. This rendering is needlessly full, but is so made for the sake of perspicuity.

But as an objection to rendering *χρηματίσαι* actively and at the same time as a defense for rendering it passively, it is alleged that the same verb occurs in the active form in a passage in the New Testament where it cannot be rendered passively. Now even allowing that this were the case, though it certainly is not, still would the conclusion follow? Clearly not. If a verb be found in the active form in Greek in a connection where it cannot be rendered actively in English, (a rare case indeed!) it by no means thence follows that the same form must be rendered passively everywhere, especially in a case where it may with per-

fect ease be rendered actively. To so assert is to introduce as a rule of translation a principle which is clearly illicit. But to the passage, which is the following:

"For the woman who hath a husband, is bound by the law to her husband, so long as he liveth: but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of the husband. So then if while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress."

She shall be called, χρηματίσει, an adulteress. Such is the passage in which, it is alleged, that the active form of the verb in hand should have a passive rendering. We think the position wholly incorrect, and maintain that an active rendering is both practicable and necessary. 1. It is practicable. This is evident from the following, which gives the precise sense of the clause: So then if, while her husband is alive, she marries another man, she *will act* the adulteress. This is active, and therefore true to the form of the verb, as well as to its meaning. 2. It is necessary. Paul does not mean merely to say what the woman *shall be called* in a certain event, but to state what she will do. She will *act* the adulteress. Not simply she shall be *called* one; for this she might be, and yet not be one in fact. *Shall be called*, therefore, is not the meaning of χρηματίσει. It should hence be rendered differently; that is, it should be rendered both actively, and so as at the same time to give its true sense. Χρηματίσει μοιχαλῆς, when predicted of a woman, clearly means, she will act the adulteress.

Here it is proper to present and do justice to another feature in the subject in hand. Χρηματίζω neither primarily nor necessarily means to name or give a name. Primarily it means to deal with, do with, or transact business of any kind; but what precise or particular act it expresses in a given case cannot be learned merely from the word itself. Had we the expression Σαῦλος ἐχρηματίσει, Saul *chramatised*, standing by itself apart from all limiting, qualifying, and defining circumstances, we should never be enabled to say what it means or what Saul did. It is by the aid of the other words used in connection with it that we learn what it means. Such is the case in all instances of its use in the New Testament. Clearly it is by aid of μοιχαλῆς that we learn that the expression χρηματίσει μοιχαλῆς means to act the adulteress. So in the passage in hand, we learn that it here means to give a name by means of the other words used in connection with it. But the question is, why is this particular word used in this passage? Certainly it is not the word ordinarily used in giving a name. That word is καλέω usually, sometimes one of several others, but never this word except in the present case. I am free to confess that I have no satisfactory reason at hand for the use of the word. It is alleged, I well know, that it was used to indicate that the name in ques-

tion was given by divine direction. But this reason is not conclusive. It could be as successfully argued from the use of *καλέω* that the name had a divine origin as from the use of *χρηματίζω*. No satisfactory reason, therefore, it seems, can be assigned for the use of the word. When we have said it seemed good to the Spirit that it should be used, we have said all we can say.

Finally, in regard to the name Christian, we beg to say that although we believe Saul and Barnabas gave it, yet we do not wish to be understood as claiming for it any special pre-eminence over the other names of the children of God found in the New Testament. These names are all alike honorable and all alike expressive with us. We think that no one of them should be used to the exclusion of the others, or in preference to the others. We love the name Christian, we love the name disciple, we love the name brethren, and we even love the name saint, though we should greatly prefer the name holy; and so impassioned is our love for these names that we cannot bear to see even one of them in the least degraded. May our own respect for them and that of our brethren never be less.

II.

WHEREFORE I say to you, all manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven to men; but the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit shall not be forgiven to men. And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man it shall be forgiven him: but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Spirit it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come. Mat. xii: 31-32.

Few passages in the New Testament have led to more inquiry than this; and few have obtained less satisfactory answers. It has long been the subject of much dreamy thought, much loose talk, and much idle conjecture. The fact that there is a sin under Christ, whether actual or barely possible need not here be said, which shall never be forgiven—a sin for which expiation has never been made—is a fearful thought. And then the vague feeling that it may not be impossible to commit it even now is positively alarming. We shall devote a little space to jotting down our thoughts upon the subject, in no vain hope certainly that the hand which traces these lines will leave no doubt behind it; for we are not confident.

The word blaspheme is derived from *φημί*, which means to say or tell, and *βλάξ* or *βλάπτω*, but which seems not certain. If from the former, it is difficult to determine the precise effect of the word in the compound or to say with certainty what idea it adds to *φημί*. *Βλάξ* itself means slack, sluggish, stupid, effeminate. Combining it in these acceptations, or kindred ones, with *φημί* and the resulting compound *Βλασφημέω* ought to mean to speak slackly

or effeminately, or to speak that which is slack, stupid, or weak. But this is surely not the meaning of blaspheme. If the word be derived from *βλάξ* and *φημί*, its radical sense perhaps is to speak against a person or thing so as to weaken, enfeeble, or render inactive or inoperative his or its influence. Speaking *against*, however, is not inherent in the word itself, but is expressed either by *κατά* or *εἰς*. The word itself, according to the present derivation, means simply to speak that which in itself is specifically injurious—the notion of *against* being contained in the other word. But if the word be derived from *βλάπτω* as its partial root, then its meaning is something clearer. *βλάπτω* means to hinder, disable, stop, hurt, or injure. Combining with *φημί* and subjoining *εἰς* or *κατά*, and *βλασφημέω εἰς* means to speak against a person so as to injure or hurt him, or so as to hinder, check, or stop his influence or the influence of what he does or says. According to this derivation, to blaspheme against the Holy Spirit would consist in so speaking of it, its work, or word, as to injure it, or as to hinder, check, or stop the influence of its work or word. Which of these two derivations is the true one we feel unable to say. The former is generally thought to be the correct one, but the latter gives the better sense. The derivation is equally easy from both. If we derive from the former, *βλάξ* is resolved into *βλάξ* and the *ς* omitted; if from the latter, the mutilated *βλαψ* is resolved into *βλαπς* and the *π* omitted. So that nothing here enables us to say from which the derivation probably results. The meaning, to be sure, is much the same, no matter from which it comes; still there is a difference. Derived from either, and the word means to speak that which is in itself bad; that which if said against a person tends to injure him, most likely by discrediting him, if said against his word or work to render it of no effect. Such seems to be the meaning of blaspheme, so far as its meaning can be determined by its etymology.

Now that this is its true meaning is rendered almost certain by the two equivalent expressions *εἰπὴν κατὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος* and *ἐπεὶ λόγον εἰς τὸν υἱόν*, the one found in Matthew, the other in Luke, and meaning respectively to *speak against the Spirit* and to *speak a word against the Son*. To speak against the Spirit or against the Son is general, and does not define the precise feature in the thing said which is wrong; whereas to blaspheme the Spirit is specifically to speak to its injury or discredit, and so as to render its work null and its word void. Such seems to be the meaning of the expression—blasphemy against the Holy Spirit.

What drew the passage in hand from the Saviour was concisely this: He had cast out a demon by the Spirit. The Pharisees said he did this by the prince of the demons. This led him to speak of

blaspheming the Spirit. If the act of the Pharisees was an instance of the blasphemy, and there is little doubt that it was, then the blasphemy consisted in ascribing the exorcism by the Spirit to Satan—an act which clearly tended to dishonor the Spirit and discredit its work. There is little doubt that in this ascription lay the sin of the Pharisees—which accords exactly with the etymological meaning of the word. I hence conclude that its etymological meaning is its true meaning, its Scriptural meaning. In other words, that it means generally to speak to the injury of a person, but in the case in hand to the injury specifically of the Spirit, and to the hinderance of its work. This the several uses of the word in the New Testament fully justify.

But why should the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit not be pardonable, while that against the Saviour is? The answer must be purely conjectural. In both cases the act is certainly the same. In what consists the difference? It cannot be in the fact that the rank of the Saviour is inferior to that of the Spirit, neither in the fact that the Spirit performs a more important office in redemption than the Saviour. Surely the reason is not arbitrary, nor one that has no bearing on the work of salvation. It is then probably this: The Holy Spirit is the last divine agent through whom our Heavenly Father intends to work for the salvation of man. Accordingly he deems it necessary to invest its word and work with a peculiar weight and sanctity. He has sent his Son, whom the world has in large part insulted and rejected. He does not intend the Spirit shall be thus treated and the world go guiltless. He hence makes it not only a sin to speak against the Spirit, but a sin which shall never be forgiven. If this does not restrain from the sin nothing can, at least nothing will. Up to the time when the Spirit spoke for the last time to the world through the apostles, the whole of all the heavenly light which God intended man to enjoy had not been communicated to him. Up to that time therefore man had not reached the height of his responsibility. But the moment the Spirit had performed its last work and uttered its last word, man had all the light necessary to a perfect knowledge of his duty—his responsibility became complete. Hitherto he might plead some excuse for his error: now he could plead none. This last light therefore God did not intend he should slight, nor yet the medium through whom it was transmitted. He has hence made it a sin to speak either against the one or the other—a sin which shall never be forgiven.

In forming a full conception of the range within which this sin is possible, three items must be taken into the account. 1. The Spirit itself. 2. Its work, as the exorcism of a demon, or it may be any other sensible act or miracle performed by it in

attestation of the truth of the gospel. 3. Its word, or what it has said through the apostles. Now if to speak against what the Spirit did, as in the case which drew forth the remark on which we are commenting, was to speak against the Spirit itself, and we have the assurance of the Saviour that it was, then surely speaking against what it says is no less speaking against it. In three ways, then, it may be, is the blasphemy against the Spirit possible, namely, by speaking against the Spirit itself; by speaking against its work; by speaking against its word. In these three ways may this sin against it be committed.

But the question in which we of the present day have the deepest interest is this—can this sin against the Holy Spirit be now committed? We candidly believe it can. Our reasons for so believing we shall now proceed to set down. These reasons may not appear conclusive to other minds. We certainly do not wish them to appear so to any unless they are really so.

1. The act itself in which the sin consists can certainly be committed now. We can speak against the Spirit, against its work, against its word; and so speak as to discredit it and its word. The nature and effect, therefore, of the act remain the same now as in the days of the Saviour. Why then should not the offense be the same? We deeply fear it is.

2. It is no less injurious now to man's eternal interests to discredit the work of the Spirit than when the Saviour was here. The crime therefore of doing so ought, it would seem, to remain the same now as then.

3. The relation which men now sustain to the Spirit is not such as to render the act of blaspheming it less criminal than when the passage in hand was uttered. Indeed, if any difference, the relation is such as to render the act even more criminal.

4. The intention of speaking against the Spirit now cannot be different from what it was in the time of the Saviour. How then can the act to which the intention leads be less criminal? I confess I cannot see. If the criminal intent determines the criminal act, then must blaspheming the Spirit be no less a sin now than at any former time.

5. The language of the Saviour is such as to imply that the sin may be committed by any person, which would seem to imply that it may be committed at any time. "Whosoever speaketh against the Holy Spirit it shall not be forgiven him." It would be difficult indeed to show that this language applies not to persons of the present day. And if it applies to them or includes them, then clearly may the sin be now committed.

Doubtless the circumstances in which alone this sin can be committed are such as imply the clearest knowledge and most com-

plete willfulness on the part of the perpetrator. In any other case we should hardly think the sin possible. But if a man knowingly and intentionally now speaks to the dishonor of the Holy Spirit or to the certain discredit of its work or word, we have a fearful faith that it will never, never be forgiven him. And if this be true, then is the fate of many a man in this land sealed and sealed forever who little dreams thereof. The subject, however, deserves further and much thought. Hitherto it has received but little. Its deep and terrible significance entitles it to a long and thoughtful investigation.

TO THE BRETHREN IN MISSOURI.—Not long since I saw in the *A. C. REVIEW* a note from Brother T. P. Haley in which he urges you to revive your State Meeting. This suggestion is entitled to your immediate and serious consideration. Your State Meeting was once a source of no little good, and of deep delight and joy to the brotherhood. Long shall I remember the one I last attended which sat in Glasgow. How melancholy the thought that those days are gone and that meeting no more! Joel H. Haden who met with us then now sleeps his last sleep; and that noble band of brothers who composed the sitting is broken forever. Though strangers and sojourners in other lands, we have not forgotten the better days of Missouri. Would that those days could return to us and we return to them! Revive your State Meeting, brethren; and when you come together, be it to pray and take counsel in the spirit of the Master for the good of his cause. Pass no resolutions on the fretting issues of the day. Let your own faultless lives and high affectionate bearing as Christians render any such suspicious measures wholly unnecessary. Now more than at any former time you need unity of spirit, and united and persistent action. Many of your strong men now toil in other fields. Chide them not; it is not their fault. Their hearts and prayers are with you; and what is better still, Christ and the Bible are with you. With these you cannot fail. Pardon the suggestion, but in all your deliberations let the safety and integrity of the churches be your first and deepest concern. These saved, little is lost; these lost, nothing is saved. Let all your efforts tend to melt and weld the saints together. With fondest and tenderest wishes for your welfare.

M. E. L.

BAPTISM IN ONE SPIRIT INTO ONE BODY.

"For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free: and have been all made to drink into one Spirit." 1 Cor. xii: 13.

The question, how is it that by one Spirit we are all baptized into one body? has, heretofore, caused no little perplexity; and as long as it is put in the words here used, it will never cause less. I propose to devote the present article to the solution of the difficulty. Whether I shall be successful or not must be left to the decision of the candid reader. I am anxious to awaken inquiry in regard to the question, and if in the end I shall be so fortunate as to elicit, from any source, its true solution, then will this preliminary piece have been written to good effect.

In order to keep my remarks within proper limits, and to free the subject to be discussed as much as possible from collateral issues, I wish to state, in the outset, that the word baptism will be employed throughout this piece as exactly equivalent to the word immersion. Consequently, I shall use either the latter term or use the two interchangeably. Thus the mode of baptism, as something has been termed of which the Bible knows nothing, will be left entirely out of view.

To my brethren I wish to say that some of the views herein expressed may strike them as novel. Should this be the case, I wish to remind them that no view is to be rejected merely because it is new. The question is not is it new, but is it true; and if so, its being new forms no ground for rejecting it. Its being new should certainly make us cautious not to receive it on insufficient evidence, but no more. If my premises be sound and adequate, no inclination will, I hope, be evinced to reject the conclusion. Let these, then, be duly weighed, and I am not anxious as to the result.

The first point to be settled is the exact import of the phrase "one body." To what does it relate, or for what does it stand? To this no very lengthy reply is needed; still it is necessary to have one that is clear and true. That it relates to *the church*, and is a figurative expression standing for it, might be taken for granted, as it is universally conceded. Still a few thoughts strengthening this concession will be in place.

The verse preceding the one cited at the commencement of this article reads thus: "For as the body is one," that is, the human body, "and hath many members, and all the many members of

that one body being many, are one body : so also is Christ," that is, so also is Christ one body. Since, then, he is or has one body and not two nor many, the question arises what is it? The following language of Paul supplies the answer. "And he (Christ) is before all things, and by him all things consist. And he is the head of the body, *the church*." The church, then, is *the one body*. Consequently the church is that into which we are baptized. Now that the phrase, the church, and the kingdom, as the latter is used in John iii : 5, are identical in sense, is admitted by all the soundest critics of the Bible. Nor does the correctness of this admission allow of so much as even a rational doubt. When, then, the church is conceived of as a body, we enter it by being immersed *into* it, this implying all the changes in the inner man prescribed in the word of God ; but when it is conceived of as a kingdom, we enter it by being born into it of water and the Spirit. Now as the changes in the inner man, in the one view, correspond to being born of Spirit in the other ; so being immersed, in the one view, corresponds to being born of water in the other. As the church, the kingdom, and the body are not different things, but merely different expressions for the same thing ; so we have not different sets of acts by which we enter it, but one and the same set. The church then is one, and is that *into* which we are immersed, not that *in* which ; and I wish the distinction between that *into* which and that *in* which we are immersed, to be distinctly noticed and kept in mind.

Having now settled what that is *into* which we are immersed, I next inquire what are we immersed *in* ? As furnishing a full reply to the question, I cite the following language of John the Baptist :

"I indeed baptize you with water into repentance : but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear, he shall baptize you with the Holy Spirit and with fire." Mat. iii : 11. On this passage several questions arise which it is important here to settle.

1st. Is *with* the correct translation of *en* in the clause, "I baptize you *en* water? I do not think it necessary to argue this question at any great length. A few remarks, therefore, may suffice.

That *in* is the exact, literal equivalent in English of *en* in Greek is indisputable. Indeed, *in* is *en* itself with the *e* changed to *i*. Hence in every case where we have *en* in Greek we should have *in* in English, unless the sense demands a change. An arbitrary use of particles, or an arbitrary interchange of one for another, is utterly forbidden. And wherever anything of the kind occurs in a translation, it marks it as the work of either a corrupt or an

incompetent mind. The sense of the clause in hand does not require *with*, and its presence there is a deep stain on the memory of those who inserted it. Had it not been for Popery and its entailed corruptions, we should never have had *with* in this and several similar passages. The exact sense of the passage is: I indeed immerse you in water. But had this and like clauses read thus, the commandment of Christ would never have been set aside for the innovation of men.

Not only does *en* or *in* connect immersion with water as the common material element in which it takes place, but it also connects it with the place or district of country where it is performed; as "John did baptize in the wilderness." But on this use of the particle nothing further need be said.

2d. Must we regard the words Spirit and fire as expressing different views of the same thing, or as expressing two different things? The latter view I feel constrained to adopt, though it is not free from difficulty. To make the word "you" include, in one and the same utterance of it, two classes of persons as distinct as the bad and the good, is certainly not easy. Still I believe the circumstances of the case require it. That both these classes were present in the crowd addressed by John is certain. They might, then, be grouped together under the word "you," but at the same time be conceived of as distinct. The bad are compared, v. 10, to bad trees which were to be cut down and cast into the fire. Here the word fire is unquestionably literal. And that casting the bad trees into it, and immersing the bad persons compared to them in it, are merely different modes of expressing the same fact, seems to me almost certain. Again, the same class is compared, v. 12, to "chaff" which was to be burned with "unquenchable fire." Here, too, the word fire is literal. And to represent persons as being immersed in it, who were to be burned with it, seems necessary to a complete view of the case. Now when we remember that it is between these two comparisons, in v. 11, that we have the language, "he shall baptize you in fire," it is very difficult to understand the word "fire" in any other than a literal sense. And if we construe the word "fire" literally, all else is easy. Expanded a little, John's language then means—he shall immerse the good among you in Spirit, but the bad in fire. A circumstance which goes far to strengthen this conclusion is this, that though the language, "baptize you in the Holy Spirit," is twice repeated subsequently, the phrase "in fire" is omitted in both cases, which would seem to imply that John expressed a fact by it which does not belong to baptizing in Spirit.

From the Scripture now cited we learn that there are three things in which men may be or are to be immersed, namely,

water, fire, and Spirit. Water is the common material element in which all who believe in Christ and resolve to forsake their sins are to be immersed. Fire is the fearful element in which the ungodly are finally to be immersed. But what shall I say of being immersed in Spirit? First, is it literal? Second, who are the subjects of it? These two questions demand special answers.

Before attempting these answers, however, it is very pertinent to inquire what we mean by a literal, and what by a figurative baptism, and to point out the distinction between them. On no subject known to me is the public mind more bewildered than on this. It requires a thorough elucidation, though it can here receive but a paragraph.

When I speak of immersing a man in water, this is called a literal baptism; but when I speak of immersing one in fire, this is called figurative. What now is the real distinction between them? and why is this called figurative, that literal? Clearly the word literal expresses, in the one case, no more than the frequency, while the word figurative expresses in the other, no more than the unfrequency of the act. Were it a very common thing to immerse in fire, but very uncommon to immerse in water, then we should term this figurative, that literal. But suppose it were equally common to immerse in both, and that we called the former literal, but the latter figurative, what then would be the distinction between the terms? Obviously that the word literal would relate solely to the water, and the word figurative solely to the fire. Consequently neither term refers to *the act* proper; for this is the same whether it takes place frequently or unfrequently, in water or in fire. Hence, in all cases where baptism is spoken of as literal or as figurative, let the reader bear in mind that these terms have no immediate reference to the act itself, especially that they express no modification of it; but that they exclusively relate either to the frequency or unfrequency of the act, or to that in which it takes place. Now although what is here said is evidently true, and is so perceived by the mind as soon as it is stated; yet, unless I am much mistaken, this is not the distinction in the popular mind between a literal and a figurative baptism. A literal baptism in the popular mind is a real or actual baptism, whereas a figurative baptism is in fact no baptism at all, but only something more or less resembling it. In this view the word literal relates immediately to the act itself, and expresses it in its simplest form; while the word figurative also relates immediately to it, but denotes an almost total modification of it. Yet indisputably this is wrong. For the word baptism has one and only one immutable meaning. It expresses a single specific act—immersion—which is incapable of modification. Change

this act and it becomes a new thing; it is neither a literal nor a figurative baptism, but a new act, and is to be expressed by a new word.

When, therefore, I say of one man, he is baptized in water, and of another, he is baptized in fire, the acts, though not identical, are yet so exactly similar that the one has not a shade of meaning which the other has not. Consequently all the popular talk we hear about figurative baptisms, as if in them the word baptism expresses less strictly an act of immersion than when it relates to water, is mere twaddling. Not the slightest foundation exists for the supposed distinction.

In like manner, when John says of the Saviour, "he shall baptize you in Spirit," I am constrained to conclude that the word baptism expresses *as strictly an act of immersion* as though it related to water. In the language, "I baptize you in water," the word baptize expresses a real act of immersion, the word water a real element, while *in* locates the one in the other. So also in the words, "he shall baptize you in fire," baptize expresses the same real act, fire a real element, while *in* connects them together. How else, now, can I reason in regard to the expression, "he shall baptize you in Spirit?" Unless my procedure is capricious and arbitrary, I am compelled to say that the word baptize expresses a real, literal immersion, the word Spirit the real ethereal thing in which it takes place, while *in* locates that in this. To this conclusion I am pinned down by principles which I cannot break. Unless I disregard both the laws of thought and the laws of language, I find it impossible to reject it.

Now let no groundless inference be drawn from the fact that I have been using simply the word Spirit, and not the combination the Holy Spirit. I have been using it alone merely because it happens to occur alone in the passage on which I have been commenting; I mean by it, however, always the Holy Spirit.

But who are the subjects of this baptism? Are they such persons only as were endowed with miraculous gifts in the primitive church, or are they all Christians? The former is the view of my brethren. Let it be patiently examined. Even here, however, I shall be frank enough to intimate a doubt as to the correctness of it.

Why, I inquire, should it be thought that baptism in the Spirit is to be thus limited? That it is so limited is clearly an assumption. Baptism in the Spirit does not consist in endowing the mind with miraculous powers, as seems to have been so generally taken for granted. At least it is by no means in evidence before us that it consists in this. Baptism in the Spirit is *an immersion in it*. This immersion the Saviour himself performs. "He shall

baptize you in the Spirit." But the Saviour does not endow with miraculous gifts; this is the work of the Spirit. Now it is in what the Saviour does that the immersion consists, and not in what the Spirit does. What the Saviour does is one thing; what the Spirit does, a different thing. That is the immersion, this the endowing.

But let us examine the several passages in which the language in question occurs, and see what conclusion they yield.

1st. The language of John: "He shall baptize you in the Spirit." Now, to limit the word *you* in this passage to such persons only as were to be miraculously endowed seems to me to be a most unwarrantable restriction. I grant it did not include all John's audience; for the bad were excluded, excluded not by the force of the word itself, but by the circumstances of the case. But it is impossible to show that any others were excluded. As all the bad were to be immersed in fire, it seems a necessary inference that all the good were to be immersed in Spirit. Still I would not represent this as decisive of the case. But that it raises a strong presumption against limiting baptism in the Spirit exclusively to the miraculously endowed, I think not doubtful.

2d. The statement of the Saviour: "For John truly baptized in water, but ye shall be baptized in the Holy Spirit not many days hence." Acts i: 5. Here the word *ye* clearly relates to and includes only the apostles. What now is the fair mode of reasoning in the case? Confessedly it is this: The promise in the present passage, that they should be baptized in the Spirit, is made to the apostles only. No others consequently have the right, merely from this single passage, to expect the promise to be fulfilled in them. Still if we have other passages going to show that others besides the apostles either were to be, or were, thus baptized, then the word *ye* is to be construed as including certainly only the apostles, but as excluding no others from the baptism. Now we know positively that others besides the apostles were baptized in the Spirit. The question then arises, were even these all? and may it not be true of all Christians that they are thus baptized? We simply say *may* it not be true?

It is proper here to remark that both in the case of the apostles at Pentecost, and in that of Cornelius, the baptism in Spirit was immediately attended by miraculous endowments. But conferring these endowments was not baptizing in the Spirit. They were an impartation from the Spirit, but did not constitute the immersion in it. When immersed in the Spirit then the mind became, though not, it may be, in all cases, extraordinarily endowed by it. The endowment was from the Spirit; the immersion from the Saviour and in the Spirit. The endowment evinced

two things—both the immersion in the Spirit, and the degree to which it energized the mind. But had the latter not been evinced, could we have inferred that the former had not taken place? I think not. And if such inference would have been illegitimate then, no less so is it now.

It is, perhaps, the coincidence between these two mentions of baptism in the Spirit, and the extraordinary manifestations which attended the two instances to which they relate, that has led to the belief that such baptism consisted in conferring these endowments. Yet a moment's reflection ought to be sufficient to convince any one that this conclusion is not implied in the premises. Immersion in the Spirit is a fact, and may conceivably be true of all Christians, while extraordinary endowments may well be deemed an accidental accompaniment, evincing itself only in the case of a few. It is not here positively affirmed that this is the case, but only that it may be.

3d. The language of Peter in regard to Cornelius: "And as I began to speak the Holy Spirit fell on them, as on us in the beginning. Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized in water, but ye shall be baptized in the Holy Spirit." Acts xi: 15-16.

On this passage little comment is necessary. It presents no new points, and hence needs no special elucidation. One thing in it, however, is worthy of notice. The word "*ye*," which, when applied by the Saviour to the apostles, denoted them exclusively, is here so interpreted as to denote, besides the apostles, the Gentiles. This shows that baptism in the Spirit was to be of much wider application than the words *you* and *ye* when applying to particular audiences would seem to indicate. Indeed, it would rather go to show that its application, among the good at least, is unlimited, unless a limit is marked by the absence of miraculous endowment. Such limit can be thus marked on only one of two conditions, to-wit: either that the baptism is identical with the endowment, or that the endowment is an invariable indication of it. The former is positively false; and the latter can never be shown to be true. So far, then, it appears that we have no very decisive reasons for limiting baptism in the Spirit to the miraculously endowed.

4th. The passage cited at the commencement of this article: "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free: and have been all made to drink into one Spirit." Or more accurately, and far more strikingly, thus: *For in one Spirit we were all immersed into one body, whether we were Jews or Greeks, bond or free; and were all made to drink one Spirit.*

Now be it borne in mind, that the subject treated of in the chapter in which this passage occurs—the subject which elicited the passage—is the miraculous endowments possessed by certain members in the church at Corinth. Let all, therefore, be first granted that the context requires. I then ask, can we so construe the word “*we*” as to make it include only the members thus endowed? That it includes them is certain; but that it includes only them we think not tenable. The word “*we*” has here the same extent of signification as the word *body*, and includes *the whole membership of the church of Christ*. Whether originally Jews or Greeks, bond or free, it embraces them all. This much may in confidence be set down as true. Now that every individual included in the word “*we*” becomes a member in this body by being immersed in one Spirit into it, is actually asserted. From this, if correct, it would follow that *every Christian, even now, whether endowed or not is immersed in the one Spirit*. This conclusion, it will be perceived, is contingently drawn, and is therefore not deemed indisputable.

Add to this the reasonings which have gone before and this conclusion becomes, it seems to me, something more than plausible. And why should it not be entirely correct? It might, perhaps, perplex us much to find at once a very satisfactory answer to this question. Still the preceding facts, train of thought, and present problematic conclusion, are all submitted, not as ultimate, but as meriting further consideration before being finally decided.

But here perhaps I shall be asked *how* it is that we are all immersed in the one Spirit? I do not protest against the question, but I do against basing on it an objection against a statement of holy writ. We are all immersed in one Spirit. This for the present I beg to consider as probably true; and if so, its inexplicable nature can never be made the ground of a valid objection against it. Besides, it is hazardous to attempt the explanation of such facts. In every case we may fail, as in most we no doubt do; and even at best the explanation remains uncertain. And an objection against any part of the inadequate explanation is somehow generally felt to be an objection against the fact itself. Still at the risk of being thought even speculative, to say nothing of hazardous, I shall venture a few suggestions in the way of explanation. They are submitted in much caution.

To what, first, pertains the immersion in Spirit? Not surely to the body. For this, visibly at least, we have a grosser act, the immersion in water. But let no one infer, because I thus speak, that the immersion in water pertains merely to the body. It pertains to the whole man, is his voluntary act, and has the consent of his whole heart. I use the language for the sake of presenting a bold antithesis, and not as being strictly correct. We have a

visible church in this world, but not of it. Into this church we all enter by a visible immersion of the body in water. To the eye, the whole seems exterior and material; and it is within the view of the eye that I am now speaking. But to the soul, if all that has now been said be true, pertains a more mysterious act. Its subtle nature demands a sublimer immersion than the one in water. *To the soul, therefore, we may conclude, pertains the immersion in Spirit.* As the immersion of the body in water connects it with the visible church, making it flesh of the church's flesh; so the immersion of the soul in Spirit connects it with the church's spirit, making it spirit of its spirit.

Still, how is it that this immersion is effected? The body of each Christian man is a temple. In this temple dwells the Holy Spirit. So at least teaches the word of God. Now when a literal temple is filled with light, every object in it is immersed in that light. So when the human body is filled with the Holy Spirit, the soul in it is immersed in that Spirit. Such is my best answer to the question, and a poor one it may be indeed. At the instant when the body is immersed in water, the instant in which it passes from the world into a kingdom which is not of the world, in that instant the Spirit of that kingdom, which is the Holy Spirit, enters the body. Then it is, if at all, that the immersion of the human Spirit takes place in the Holy Spirit. The inner man is then immersed as well as the outer, that in Spirit, this in water; and both into the one mystic body, which is Christ.

I again repeat the question asked a little while ago, why should this not be so? We all agree that in the Christian, though undowered miraculously, the Spirit dwells no less than in him who is thus endowed. And if the soul of the inspired man is literally immersed in the Spirit which dwells in him, why not as well the soul of the uninspired be literally immersed in the Spirit which dwells in him? The fact that the Spirit endows the one miraculously but not the other, is no evidence that the one is not as really immersed in the Spirit as the other.

Anciently and temporarily the Spirit miraculously endowed certain members in the church. The time at length came, however, when these endowments were not needed, and hence ceased. But we have no reason to conclude that when the necessity for these endowments ceased, the necessity also ceased for being immersed in the Spirit. It is by no means probable to my mind that these endowments were the only benefits derived from being immersed in the Spirit; and if not, as long as the other benefits were needed the immersion would continue. And since it is difficult to conceive that these other benefits were not permanently needed, it is hence difficult to conceive that the immersion ever

ceased. In addition to being simply immersed in the Spirit in those days, it specially endowed certain individuals; in addition to being simply immersed in it now, it "helps our infirmities;" and not more necessary was that work to the founding of the church, than is this to its perpetuity. I hence see no reason to conclude that immersion in the Spirit once established would ever cease.

Three questions stand connected with every separate immersion established by the Lord, namely: what are we immersed in, what into, and what for? John immersed in water, into *metanoya*, that is, into a state in which the resolution to forsake sin became consummated, in the actual abandonment of it, and for remission of sins. Under the reign of Christ we are immersed, first in water, into the church, and for remission of sins; second, in Spirit, into the one body, but for what? Be it what it may, it is something pertaining immediately to the soul and needed by it; and what so much needed as purifying it? Though sins be remitted, their stain may still cleave to the soul. Immersing it in the *Holy Spirit* would free it from all these and render it pure and holy. Let it now be true that this is the object for which the soul is immersed in the Spirit, and we should then have a most expressive reason for denominating the Spirit *Holy*, namely, because it renders the human spirit holy.

After all, it will be perceived that the difference between the foregoing views and those entertained by my brethren is slight. They hold that the Spirit now dwells in Christians; also that it "helps our infirmities." But, in addition to this, is the human spirit immersed in it? This presents the precise point of difference, if difference there still be. I frankly confess I strongly incline to the side of the immersion. If my brethren dissent they will do it from the love of truth; and we shall still be one in charity.

Should any one feel inclined to fault the preceding views on the ground that they are rather speculative, I shall attempt neither to deny the charge nor to make a defense against it. My desire is truth and not error, neither speculation. But this I confess, I love occasionally to let my mind float a little even over a divine theme. In such free, airy excursions discoveries are sometimes made. Let us only not conclude that they are always made; and especially let us be careful that our speculations are never written down as dogmatic truths to which others are to be compelled to subscribe.

To one thought more let me here give utterance. When the body is immersed in water, we drink the material element in which it is immersed. Can it be so that the apostle for the same reason represents us as "drinking the Spirit?" When the soul is

in the act of being immersed in the Spirit, does the Spirit flow into it, and does the soul drink it as "living water?" It would be curious if a most trivial incident in immersion in water should have suggested this thought to the apostle.

But to the preceding hints and suggestions, for I intend the contents of this paper to be nothing more, many will object—some in reason, some without it. And to what, I may well ask, will men not object? Surely to what is true more even than to what is false. Of these objections some will be well founded, others not. Some of them I myself can readily see; others, perhaps, and it may be decisive, lie wholly out of my sight. Some of the former I think it proper to notice before closing this article.

1. The first objection I notice will be based on the relative position of the words in question. In all other instances in the New Testament, where the element in which the baptism takes place is mentioned, the word expressing the element follows the word expressing the act; as I baptize in water; he shall baptize in the Holy Spirit and in fire. In the present case, however, this order is inverted; and we have—in one Spirit we are all baptized. But does this inverted order affect the sense of the words, or must we suppose their meaning changed because the order of succession is changed? If not, then this objection amounts to nothing. Whether, then, we say, in one Spirit we are all baptized, or, we are all baptized in one Spirit, seems to me to be a circumstance in no sense affecting the meaning of the words. I see not why we should, or how we can, on that account, and that only, defend a difference in the expressions. If difference there yet be, what it is, clearly is not obvious.

2. But the most striking objection will rest on Paul's expression—"one baptism." If, it may be asked, the body is immersed in water and the spirit in Spirit, then are there not *two* baptisms and not *one*? It is certainly no part of the intention of these remarks to extenuate the force of any legitimate objection. On the contrary, the intention is to present, on the one hand, a hypothesis which may possibly be true, or rather a probable solution of a difficult passage, and, on the other, to state the objections thereto fully and fairly. Accordingly, we shall neither deny nor attempt to underrate the force of the preceding objection. Yet we believe it capable of being fully met; but even allowing it not to be, we still think it inconclusive against the preceding view.

When Paul says there is one baptism, he is obviously using the word baptism in its ordinary sense as expressing an act connected with water. His meaning is, there is one immersion in water. A plurality of immersions in water is clearly the antithesis of his

expression, and the thing he impliedly denies. There is, in other words, one public outward act which is performed in water, which is immersion—*this is one*. Such we think the import of his language; and if so, his saying that there is one baptism, meaning this one, by no means implies that there is not another of a different kind. In that case the mention of the other baptism would have to be attended by some qualifying epithet or other circumstance indicating that it, and not the baptism ordinarily meant by the word, is the one spoken of. And this is actually the case. Whenever baptism in Spirit is meant the words in Spirit are always subjoined to express that fact. With these few remarks we dismiss the present objection.

3. But it will be said that the meaning of the passage is, that by the teaching of the one Spirit through the apostles we have all been induced to submit to the one baptism in water, and by that act have all become united to and are therefore component members of the one body. This view is not without weight, neither is it free from difficulty. We once held it as the most probable view of the passage, but seriously distrust it now. The long and not very smooth ellipsis which it requires us to supply lies strongly against it. It is besides objectionable on other grounds which we shall not consume space to state here. Finally, we submit the matter to the discriminating and thoughtful reader in hope that if what is herein said be not true, it may at least prove no hindrance to him in his search after the truth.

THE RESOLUTION OF THE CHURCH OF CHRIST IN BIRMINGHAM, ENGLAND.—On reading the following Resolution the deepest emotions of our heart were stirred, and for a moment we felt almost overpowered. With profound gratitude we accept this token of sympathy from our brethren in Birmingham, and beg of them, in the language of Brother King, Editor of their own *Millennial Harbinger*, “to continue thus to remember us till the brighter day arrive.” The following is the Resolution:

“That this church affectionately invite the brethren and churches throughout the United Kingdom to unite with them on the second Lord’s day in February in special prayer for the tried and suffering brethren and churches in America, to the end that the Lord may graciously support, strengthen, and give them a happy issue out of all their troubles.”

This Resolution has the high approval of our whole heart. No partisan spirit taints the noble feeling it breathes, or renders it painful to the Christian of any land or clime. Morning, noon, and night, beloved brethren of Britain, will you continue to fill the ears of the Master with your prayers in our behalf. Then shall we never weary in hoping.

REVIEW OF "THETA" ON COMMUNION.

THE importance of the question, "Do the unimmersed commune?" is practical, not speculative. "Theta" says its value is to be found in the practical influence the decision of the question is to have over the conduct of our churches toward other professors of religion. We think that there is another value attached to the question far more primary or elementary than this, to-wit: the practical influence which its decision is to have over the conduct of our churches towards the word of the living God.

The first and most important question is, What do the New Testament Scriptures teach, as to what sort or character of persons have a right to the Lord's Supper or to keep the institutions of the gospel? The decision of this is prior, in order of time, to the one raised by "Theta" respecting the conduct of our churches toward other professors of religion.

In an attempt to return to the primitive or apostolic gospel, any issue that affects the perfectness of that return is of the same importance as truth itself. The guiding thought of those who aim at apostolic faith and practice must be the plain simple teaching of God's word. If this guide is not followed, then, we are left to be directed solely by human opinion, or by a mixture of human opinion and divine truth, in the matter of religion. The first named principle is the most elementary conception of the present Reformation. The second distinguishes mere philosophy, and the third is the fundamental fact in the various religious sects of Christendom. If the Scriptures are really made the guide and authoritative rule in all matters of religious faith and practice, then the church may be permanent and consistent—its foundation being the authority of prophets and apostles, that of Christ being supreme over all. But if any other principle be assumed, the result will make the church changeable, and her history will be full of inconsistencies.

"Theta" admits three postulates as Scriptural facts: 1. That no man can enter the church or kingdom on earth without being born of water and Spirit. 2. That the Lord's Supper is an institution belonging entirely to the members of the church. 3. That the New Testament Scriptures do not contemplate any, except those who have been immersed, as communicants at the Lord's table. "Theta" then remarks: "That these are Bible truths is wholly unassailable, the command being to preach them fully and to bring all the honest-hearted to their full appreciation and

acceptance." In all candor, does not this settle forever the question in hand? We think it does; and we believe that "Theta" himself, were he not blinded by a misplaced affection for pious men who have been led astray, would see it in all its amplitude.

But in the face of those three "grand postulates" he says: "It may still be a legitimate inquiry, whether God ever makes allowance for the unfortunate circumstances of some good men so as to admit them into his church with anything less than a perfect understanding and a perfect obedience to these established conditions of salvation." On this we remark: 1. That the inquiry is *not* legitimate, or it does not follow in regular sequence, if the object of it is to find a way of admission into the church upon any other than the established conditions named; since this would be but a bold and defiant rejection of revealed divine authority. This will be admitted. But 2. If "Theta" only means that it is a "legitimate inquiry" whether God in the Christian *Scriptures* makes allowance for some good men so as to admit them into the church on another plan, or on different conditions from those which he calls "established," we enter no objection to it, simply as a question of fact. In this view of "Theta's" meaning the inquiry is, simply, whether the word of God contains, as a fact, *two* plans of admission into the church—one for those who understand the first named or "established" conditions, and another for "some good men" who innocently, in human judgment, fail to comply with them. That the word of God contains two sets of terms of entering into the kingdom no well-informed man will assert. And though we do not think that "Theta" intended to affirm so absurd a proposition, in our judgment he has done it by necessary implication, since his conclusion is that "some good" men who have not complied with immersion, which is one of the "established conditions," do really enter the kingdom. 3. But why institute the inquiry for "some good men?" *Why not for all good men in unfortunate circumstances?* The unfortunate circumstances of "some," are no more to be pitied than the unfortunate circumstances of all—who are really good. If the *Scriptures* teach a plan of admission into the church for some good men with less than a compliance with all of the established conditions, on account of the unfortunate circumstances which surrounded them—that is "some" good men—then it follows, on a principle of justice and impartiality, that all good men are, or ought to be, admitted into the church, and for precisely the same reason. If there be one truth more clearly revealed than another, it is this: God is a just Being. An overwhelming proof of his justice lies in two facts: 1. He has planted the principle of the Just in the human mind. 2. In his word he has commanded men to do justly by one

another. But where would be the justice of admitting one good man into the kingdom without a perfect compliance with the "established conditions," on account of the unfortunate circumstances that surrounded him, and of rejecting another good man, who, with less than a perfect compliance with the established conditions, had the same unfortunate circumstances to commend him to the same principle of mercy?

"Theta," however, may say that his language does not exclude some good men, while it admits others, on account of unfortunate circumstances, into the church, with less than a perfect understanding and obedience to the established conditions. We do not assert that his language does this. But he has left the point in an ambiguous light; and this very fact helps to cover up the unsoundness of his argument. Let it be assumed that all good men gain admittance into the church on account of the unfortunate circumstances that prevented them from understanding and obeying the established conditions of Scripturally entering into the church, and then we can see the argument as it is. This is, in point of fact, the ground of "Theta's" reasoning.

The phrase "good men" cannot, so far as this question is concerned, be confined to the "unimmersed" alone. Certainly there are many "good men" among the Quakers who have not been baptized in or with water according to any "mode" whatever. Will any one dispute that there have been many Quakers who would have been joyfully immersed, if they had only known that it is certainly the will of God? To answer no is to affirm that there never has been a good man among that sect. "Theta's" intellect is too sharp and his heart too tender to assume this position. His argument, then, gives them admittance into the church without baptism at all. The second plan, therefore, of entering the kingdom is, minus baptism of any sort. One of the "established conditions" is in this case not relaxed, but abrogated entirely; yet admission into the church is gained as perfectly as if it were complied with. Now just as much can in truth be said for Papists; there are many good men among them, both of laity and clergy, and these are to be considered as genuine members of the church. Their mistake was sprinkling or pouring, in place of immersion; nevertheless they are in the kingdom by the side of the unsprinkled, unpoured, and unimmersed Quaker. In a word, all "good men" are members of the church of God on account of God's allowance for their unfortunate circumstances. This is the true form of "Theta's" argument.

Now, are there no "good men" who are not formally members of any church? We have seen many of them whose loving spirit and excellent lives ought to put many professed Christians to

shame. They are honestly of opinion that God does not absolutely require them to become members of any church; but they believe he is acceptably worshiped and served by living morally. They live honorable and virtuous lives, and die serenely in hope of a better world. Their unfortunate circumstances completely blind them. Now these also are to be regarded as in the kingdom. There are thousands of them attempting their salvation by the works of the moral law instead of by faith in Christ; and their mental blunder is to be traced to "circumstances" as much as the blunder of Quakers and Pedobaptists. Then what is to be thought of that dense mass of human beings whom we denominate heathens—millions, and millions more, who do not possess the Bible at all? Are none of these "good," when judged by a standard that is just and benevolent to their "unfortunate circumstances?" Do not their hearts inquire for God whom they love in the "unfortunate circumstances" of their birth and education? Would not thousands of them love God if they knew him? Would not countless numbers of them joyfully believe in the Lord Jesus, if they only knew him? Would they not be pure and lovely in Christian graces of character—if they only "had a chance?" Many of them are men of some sublime virtues. Cicero was a good man—Socrates was good—and M. Cousin says that he would have delighted to embrace Christianity. "*Theta's*" argument, when applied to Cicero and Socrates and thousands of living heathen, will place them in the church, along with those who enter by obedience to all the established conditions. For the principle which allows for the unfortunate circumstances of those who mistake sprinkling and pouring for immersion, must allow also for the unfortunate circumstances in which every other honest blunder is committed. Now, then, only think of what a membership we have got in the church. Not only the unimmersed, but the unbaptized—that is, the unsprinkled and unpoured¹—the non-professor, and many who never so much as heard that there is a gospel of salvation by Christ. In a word, all good men are in the kingdom, and are entitled to the Lord's Supper. Do not all the good on earth commune in fact, in intencion, though they never literally come to the table? We feel assured that "*Theta*" will demur to this conclusion. For it is an elaboration of his argument which shows its absurdity; and we are only surprised that he did not see it before he concluded his defense of "*some*" good men.

The fallacy of "*Theta*" is this, that no one can be saved in heaven who is not a member of the church on earth. There is no

¹ No Pedobaptist critic will chastise me for using unsprinkled and unpoured, as it is his own form of words. I merely prefix a negative particle.

authority for such a position. Now because some good men—as Luther—was not in the church on earth according to the established conditions of entering the kingdom, "*Theta*" assumes that God admits him into the church on earth by abolishing, in his case, some condition of membership, in order to save him in heaven. Hence all men like Luther are true members, and are to be accepted as proper communicants at the Supper. This is a marvelous blunder. If Luther was worth saving—a question which we do not dispute—then our Father forgave him his errors, that is all. And so our kind Father may forgive the errors of some men of the world and of many heathens, and save them; but that fact no more puts men of the world, as real members, into the church on earth than it translates them to the moon. If our divine Father save any man in heaven who on earth was not born of water and Spirit, it is an independent act of sovereignty; and if he save any man who complied with only one or two of the terms of entering the earthly kingdom, and made a blunder in respect to the third and final one, it is a sovereign act of mercy of the Great Judge which in nowise affects the terms of the apostolic commission. That God will make every allowance for every man that justice and mercy demand we do most joyfully believe; but this no more affects the "established conditions" of entering the kingdom—no more brings a character to the Lord's table not contemplated in the Scriptures, than it affects the present state of the physical sciences. The church is constituted by divine authority. The terms of admission are matters of divine revelation and authority, over which no logic and no charity have any control. Our logic and kind affections cannot put a man in the church any more than they can give a man admittance into the everlasting city of peace.

"*Theta*" assumes that Luther is in heaven. Now we certainly have no prejudice against the great Reformer, and surely no hatred; yet truth and candor compel us to say that we do not *know* whether Luther is in heaven or not. If "*Theta*" has had any certain information on this point we should surrender to it; still we would like first to examine the credentials of the message. But if he has no certain revelation as to where Luther is, then it is only his opinion that Luther is in heaven; or, in other words, like ourself, he knows nothing whatever on the subject. What, then, is his argument built on this unknown fact worth? Not one cent.

Besides, we have settled divinely revealed terms of admission into the church, and, by consequence, the terms of communing in the Lord's Supper. Now we should like to know what Luther in heaven or in hell has to do with changing or modifying those

conditions so as to admit a man into the church who does not comply with them? and also what it has to do with accepting a class of persons as communicants at the Lord's table whom the Scriptures never contemplated as privileged to partake of that feast? Are admission into the church and communion in the Supper to be defined by the salvation of Luther? Surely not.

"Theta" assumes the salvation of a man of a certain character, and erects upon the assumption a theory which accepts at the Lord's table persons who have not been immersed. Well now, suppose some other brother should assume the salvation of William Penn, which is just as probable as the salvation of Luther, and elaborate a theory which, when finished, should invite and accept at the Supper all "good men" of Penn's sect as members of the church. "Theta's" theory relaxes the term of immersion so as to give validity to sprinkling as its substitute. The other abolishes baptism altogether as a condition of church membership and communion. Another man, selecting a man of a different religious creed—say the Catholic Bishop, Fenelon—who, by the by, was a "good man" of a lofty type—and assuming his whereabouts in the spiritual universe, and reasoning on the same principles of "Theta," will transfer all good men among the Papists into the church, and render them acceptable communicants in the Supper. Having by the first theory got rid of immersion as an essential condition of admission into the church, the second theory abolishes baptism altogether as a term of membership; while the third theory practically destroys every distinction between Popery and, not Protestantism only, but Christianity itself! Surely this charity is broad enough to satisfy the most liberal mind. Indeed there is, in our candid opinion, no class of honest persons whom it will not transfer into the church and to the table of the Lord. It results in this simply: If a person is candid, honest, and pure in heart, and does the best he can, he will be considered by God as in the church, may commune in the Supper, if he choose, and will be saved in heaven, no matter whether he strictly obey the terms of the great divine commission or not.

This whole theory rests upon a mere speculation—an assumption which the united intellect of the world cannot prove, to-wit: that Martin Luther is in heaven. And even if it were proved, "Theta's" argument is still unsound, for the salvation of Luther cannot, in anywise abolish, change, or modify, one item of the gospel of Christ.

"Theta" admits that the terms of entering the church are fixed. But he argues that God will relax them, on account of the unfortunate circumstances of some or all good men. If God excused

Luther at the gate of heaven for not obeying some of the fixed laws of entering there, "*Theta*" demands, why should he not be excused at the door of the church for not having obeyed some of the conditions for entering the kingdom? And furthermore, he asks, who could invalidate his process of reasoning if he argue that Luther was thus excused at the door of the church. We invalidate it: 1. By stating the fact that "*Theta*" knows not that Luther was excused at the gate of heaven. 2. By the fact that God has nowhere told us in his word that he will excuse any one at the door of the church—if indeed there be such a place—for not complying with his Son's authority, and take him in anyhow.

But what if we admit the thing which no one knows, that Luther was excused or forgiven at the gate of heaven for his errors? Must the structure of the church, its terms of admission to the privileges of God's family on earth be remodeled, changed, and modified by that fact, so that an organized blunder on earth may be perpetuated through centuries as of equal authority with the truth of the Lord Jesus Christ? The mistake as to the action of baptism which Luther made is no mere intellectual blunder of a single man. To say nothing of the origin of sprinkling for baptism, it had been canonized and become part of the Romish church long before the days of the great Saxon. He merely transferred this rite from Popery into Protestantism. Thence it has spread and become an item of religious practice in several of the most powerful Protestant sects. It is propagated as truth—as divine truth—over more than half of the geographical limits of Christendom, and, to all human foresight, it may continue to be propagated for ages to come. Now "*Theta*," as well as brother Isaac Errett and Prof. Pendleton, will affirm that the sprinkling of water on a person for baptism was never commanded by the Saviour or by his apostles, and that it stands upon no divine warrant or authority, but upon human authority alone. The question then is, does this human invention transfer men into the kingdom, and give them a right to partake of the Lord's Supper? If so, then *immersion* can do no more; and so sprinkling and immersion are equal in their practical value. But "*Theta*" will say that he only affirms that unimmersed good men are in the kingdom. Well, it is true that it is only immersed good men that really enter the kingdom, except in a most formal sense. Twist and torture the matter as you may, on "*Theta's*" argument sprinkling or no baptism is of the same practical value as immersion—since a good man may enter the kingdom without being immersed, and the immersed can do no more than enter it.

But let us not wander from the point. Is the structure or the terms of admission into the church to be changed because of the

divine judgment on Luther at the gate of heaven? If so, then it is only to be done for one reason—a conflict of divine authority; that is to say, the law of discipleship must stand in conflict with the law of final judgment, so that one or the other must give way. When human statutes conflict, the more recent one prevails, and the older is considered abolished. The law of entering the kingdom must stand till repealed by him who enacted it. The consequence of "Theta's" argument seems to us to repeal this law, because the principles of the divine judgment in admitting Luther into heaven are in conflict with the strict application of the terms of the commission; and if Luther can be saved when he had not been immersed, why not untold millions more under similar "unfortunate circumstances;" and if so, then immersion as a term of entering the church is practically set aside, or, in the language of "Theta," relaxed. But from this reasoning another and very different conclusion can be legitimately reached. Not only is immersion as a divinely ordained term of admission to the church relaxed, but sprinkling or pouring receives the divine sanction at the gate of heaven! Truly here is a conflict of authority; and the very thing which was born on earth of nothing but human authority—i. e. sprinkling and pouring—is made to take precedence of immersion, and is acknowledged at heaven's gate to be as valuable to good men under unfortunate circumstances as immersion is to a good man under any circumstance, since it transfers a man from the world to the church!

The idea that Christians on earth are justifiable in taking up the supposed principles of the final judgment of God on any man or any class of men, and apply them to the terms of admission into the church for the purpose of relaxing those terms or enlarging them, or of affecting them in any way whatever, is daring and shocking in the extreme. What judgment soever may have been passed on Luther, or Penn, or Swedenborg, or Fenelon, in no way justifies any one on earth in relaxing the terms ordained by Christ and set forth in the New Testament for the admission of men into the church. And it in no way justifies the church to accept as communicants persons whom the Scriptures never did contemplate as participating in the Lord's Supper. As men were not consulted in ordaining the terms of entering the kingdom, so no man living has any power over them, or any warrant to relax them or to make them more rigorous. To us they are of supreme authority. We may relax or make them more rigorous; but is the Lord Jesus bound by our wisdom and power? We may invite persons to observe the Supper whom Christ and the apostles do not invite. What, then, are we wiser and better than they? Will it work better than the simple teaching of the apostles? Immersed

believers are members of the church, and are the very persons whom the Scriptures contemplate as communing in the Supper. There is no issue on these two points. But whether unimmersed believers are members of the church, and may of right commune, are points which the Scriptures know nothing of whatever. Scripturally such persons are not in the kingdom and have no right to commune. As to how God feels towards them, whether he will accept their will for the deed, and treat them as though they had been Scripturally translated into the church, are speculative questions which never can be solved on earth. They are matters for speculative solution, and every one may form his own opinion about them. But those opinions, whatever they may be, must not be permitted to relax or make more rigorous the law of entering the church, or operate upon the church so as to bring around the table of the Lord persons who are Scripturally excluded from it. This is all that we mean, therefore, by affirming that no supposed principles of divine judgment at the last day can be made legitimately operative in changing the terms of entering the church or of approaching the Lord's Supper. An attempt of this sort is an apostasy from the truth as it is in Christ; and whenever the attempt is made, the identity of the true church will be necessarily lost. We see the effect of this and similar principles in the history of those painful and fatal divisions of the church in whose development and progress Christianity has almost disappeared.

This brings us to consider another fact of great weight in the question before us. In admitting the unimmersed as real members of the church to the communion of the Supper, there are many other errors to be practically indorsed beside the mere fact of non-immersion. There is infant baptism, whether by dipping or sprinkling; and, in a word, all the dogmas and unauthorized practices of Pedobaptists generally, as canonized in their several human creeds and established customs. Now, if Pedobaptists are entitled, notwithstanding all these facts, as parts and parcels of their faith and practice, facts of which the Scriptures know no more than they do of unimmersed persons communing, or of baby baptism, or the supremacy of the Pope—if, notwithstanding all this, they are still entitled to sit down with our churches in the observance of the Supper, then, in the name of reason, why keep up the distinction of separate churches? Let us end all controversy by conceding that Protestantism is Christianity, and unite with all good men on the safe principle which gives the Lord's Supper to them; and relax the commandments of Christ and the apostles so much as will enable us to unite the present sectarian

world, in harmony with all the antagonisms of doctrines and practices existing in it.

"*Theta*" may reply that he does not mean to infract a single one of the three "grand postulates." We question not his meaning or motive in this respect. It is his argument and its consequences with which we are dealing. If neither no immersion, nor positive and most elementary errors in faith and practice can prevent good men in unfortunate circumstances from entering the church on earth and coming to the Lord's table, then we conclude that those errors, under such circumstances, are of the same practical value as the truth, since by the use of them entrance into the church and enjoyment of all its privileges are gained—and by the proper use of the truth no more can be gained by good men under any circumstances. When our churches, therefore, shall adopt "*Theta's*" principle and bring the unimmersed to the Supper, there is a practical infraction not only of one of the "three grand postulates," but a practical indorsement of all the errors of doctrine and practice characteristic of those unimmersed persons whom they admit to the Supper; that is, it is an admission that those errors are no bar to a real entrance into the church, which, it seems to us, is a sort of indorsement of their entire innocence to "good men" and to the real cause of the Master. For "what concord hath light with darkness?" If, then, Pedobaptists may commune with our churches, the antagonisms between us become mere intellectual conflicts, destitute of all moral principle. Therefore it is that "*Theta's*" argument, in its real consequences, breaks down the distinction between elementary truth and error in religion, and makes the condition of entering the church to be "goodness" of heart disjoined from obedience to the divinely established conditions of entering it, and turns us away from the word of God and its authority on this subject to human reasoning, according to whose principles some men, at least, are to be received as church communicants in contravention to the teaching of the Scripture.

But granting "*Theta's*" reasoning, how are our churches to determine who are the "*good*" among the unimmersed whose unfortunate circumstances create so much compassion in God that he admits them into the church on earth, and whom our churches ought to admit to the table of the Lord? Plainly and certainly, we can have no guide in the matter except the religious standing of the unimmersed in their own churches. Practically and for the practical purpose of admitting the unimmersed to the Supper, we must admit that generally, or in the main, they are all members of the church, and that all who stand well in their respective congregations are entitled to the communion. Here, then, the

real consequence of this specious theory is developed. Pedobaptists' churches are the church of Christ in every sense that can interest a sound mind. The reader can now see who it is that is charging on his favorite Rosinante, not for the defense of the iii and 5th of John, but for its entire overthrow, as well as the authority and practical force of the commission which Christ gave to his apostles. If the unimmersed in the aggregate are to be recognized as the church of Christ and as entitled to church privileges, we again demand, where is the propriety of keeping up the controversy as to the action of baptism, or where is the propriety of controverting any point, since, notwithstanding all the issues between us and them, they are just as well off as ourselves?

We now come to consider "Theta's" appeal to the word of God. Here is the true test; for if his theory be not supported by the divine word it has no authority. We are glad to bring this question to the standard which must close every mouth, and furnish our churches a safe principle of practice as it respects other professors of religion.

1. "Theta" thinks he finds in Joshua v: 2-5 a principle that sanctions the recognition of unimmersed persons as members of the church, and consequently as proper persons to observe the Lord's Supper. The case is as follows: "At that time the Lord said unto Joshua, Make thee sharp knives, and circumcise again the children of Israel the second time. And Joshua made him sharp knives, and circumcised the children of Israel at the hill of the foreskins. And this is the cause why Joshua did circumcise: All the people that came out of Egypt that were males, even all the men of war, died in the wilderness by the way, after they came out of Egypt. Now all the people that came out were circumcised: but all the people that were born in the wilderness by the way, as they came forth out of Egypt, them they had not circumcised."

Before proceeding to remark on this passage we will give the reader Thompson's translation of the second and third verses: "And at that time the Lord said to Joshua, Make thee stone knives of the hardest flint, and having again a fixed abode, circumcise the children of Israel. So Joshua made sharp knives of stone, and circumcised the children of Israel at the place called Hill of foreskins." Thompson's translation from the Septuagint.

"Theta" assumes that during the forty years of the children of Israel in the wilderness the omission to circumcise the children born there was a violation of the law of circumcision, and that the penalty of that law was not inflicted, but forgiven. But was the omission to circumcise the children born in the wilderness a violation of the divine command? In order to settle this ques-

tion we must give the entire subject our concentrated attention. Let us then attend to the original institution of circumcision. "And when Abram was ninety-nine years old the Lord appeared to Abram and said to him, 'I am thy God. Be well pleasing in my sight and be blameless, and I will establish that covenant of mine between me and thee and multiply thee exceedingly.' Whereupon Abram fell on his face, and God spake to him saying, 'On my part lo! this is my covenant with thee, Thou shalt be the father of a multitude of nations, and thy name shall no more be called Abram, but thy name shall be Abraham; because I have made thee the father of many nations; and I will increase thee exceedingly, and cause thee to become nations; and kings shall spring from thee: and I will establish this my covenant with thee and thy seed after thee, throughout their generations, for an everlasting covenant, to be thy God and the God of thy seed after thee. And I will give thee and thy seed after thee this land in which thou sojournest; even all the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession, and I will be their God.' Moreover God said to Abraham, 'On thy part thou shalt keep this my covenant; thou and thy seed after thee throughout their generations. And this is the covenant which thou shalt keep between me and you, even thy seed after thee throughout their generations, every male of you shall be circumcised. Ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin; and it shall be for a sign of the covenant between me and you. And the child of eight days old shall be circumcised among you. Every male throughout your generations, including the home born servant, and him who is bought with money from any stranger, not of thy seed. Thy home born servant and he who is bought shall surely be circumcised. And this my covenant shall be on your flesh for an everlasting covenant. And with regard to the uncircumcised male, the flesh of whose foreskin shall not be circumcised on the eighth day, that soul shall be cut off from its family, because it hath broken my covenant.'" Gen. xvii: 1-14—Thompson's translation.

Here the words "home born and stranger" servants born at home and bought with money, as well as the far-reaching phrase, "throughout their generations," all point to a settled civil state of society. When Moses incorporated circumcision into his dispensation he connected it with the institution of the Passover or Paschal Feast, where the same words as employed above indicate that both circumcision and the Passover were designed for a permanent state of society. "This is the law of the Passover—No stranger shall eat of it; but every servant born at home or bought with money thou shalt circumcise and then he may eat of it. A sojourner or a hireling shall not eat of it. In one family it shall

be eaten, and you must not carry any of the flesh abroad out of the house; nor shall you break a bone thereof. All the congregation of the children of Israel shall keep this festival. And if any proselyte come to you to keep the Passover to the Lord, thou shalt circumcise all his males and then he may come and keep it, and he shall be as a native of the land. No uncircumcised person shall eat of it. There shall be one law for the home born and for the proselyte who shall come among you." Ex. xii: 44-50.

That this law was but anticipative of the permanent settlement of the Israelites in Canaan cannot admit of the least doubt. The phrases home born, servants born at home and bought with money, the hireling and proselyte, prove this. Now it is a fact that the Passover was celebrated but a single time in the wilderness. Num. ix: 1-3. They were once commanded to keep it according "to all the rites of it and according to all the ceremonies thereof." This required all the males to be circumcised. But not observing it any more during their stay in the wilderness, the omission to circumcise their children born by the way was no transgression of the divine law, any more than the omission of the Passover itself, both of which ceased after their association and institution for the space of forty years—for the simple reason that the legislation was anticipative of a settled civil state.

So soon, therefore, as the children of Israel had crossed the Jordan, and God had fulfilled his promise to bring them into the land, he commanded that the people who had been born on the way should be circumcised and keep the Passover. Henceforward there is to be no omission either of circumcision or of the Passover, for, as Thompson translates, they had now a "fixed abode." There was no transgression in the case, as "*Theta*" has fancied; but it was a case contemplated in the very legislation itself. The language used by God to Joshua indicates no displeasure, no neglect, no improper omission. But when the entire case is viewed in all its bearings, we think no one can fail to see that it was precisely in accordance with the law or the divine will respecting that people while passing through the wilderness. This case does not give one particle of countenance to the speculation of "*Theta*," but, on the contrary, it condemns it from beginning to end. When we hear of a case in which God is said to wink at or overlook sin, we shrink and stand in doubt, and more especially in so open a case as the one we have been examining. Thus we take from "*Theta*" his first proof text that the unimmersed may commune.

2. The second Scripture brought forward by "*Theta*" is the case of David, who, when flying from Saul, entered the house of God and ate the loaves of presence or hallowed bread, which were

alone permitted to the priest and his family to eat. 1 Sam. xxi: 1-6. The first remark that we offer on this case is, that David certainly did not enter into the Tabernacle, for none except priests could go into it. But he went into the house of the high priest, which was situated beside the court of the Tabernacle, and called the house of God on that account. The apartment in which the priest Eli and Samuel slept is called the house of the Lord. 1 Sam. iii: 15. Now, does our Lord justify the act of David and of the high priest? His words are these: "Have ye not read what David did when he was hungered, and they that were with him; how he entered into the house of God and did eat the shew-bread which was not lawful for him to eat, neither for them that were with him, but only for the priests?" Matt. xii: 3-4. On these words we remark:

1. That Christ does not say that David and the high priest, who was accessory to the act, were justifiable. But the Scriptures nowhere condemn the act, and the Jewish elders and teachers had not reprobated it. It served, therefore, to repel the charge of breaking the Sabbath which had been preferred against the disciples for plucking and eating ears of corn on the Sabbath day, but which charge was in fact leveled against Jesus himself. The Jews had never condemned David for an act apparently more gross than that which was now so loudly condemned—the eating the first ripe corn in the field on the Sabbath. It clearly developed their spleen, and showed that they had no real love for the laws of God while apparently so devoted to them. This, we think, is the purport of our Lord's word. David, on the occasion referred to, not only ate of the hallowed bread, but he framed a gross falsehood which had fatal consequences. Now our Lord says not a word in condemnation of this *moral* transgression, any more than of the other; yet they are both bound up together as soul and body. We think, therefore, that the liar can as safely appeal to this case as the unimmersed; and that "*Theta's*" argument makes out as good a defense for the one as for the other.

2. The foregoing solution derives strong, almost certain confirmation, from the case of the priests, who are said "to profane the Sabbath" in the temple, and are "blameless." Christ certainly did not intend to say that the temple service on the Sabbath day was a transgression of the divine law regulating the Sabbath, for this is not true; since God had commanded the priests to perform certain services on that day. Num. xxviii: 9. But according to the crude opinions of the Pharisees such service would be a profanation. And this appears to us to indicate so much as this: that what the disciples had done was no violation of any divine law; the seeming violation existing in the ignorance of the Phar-

isees alone. In the defense of the Master there is no attempt to justify any act of transgression. "Theta" says: "Here is a telling sentence—even the priests, and that in the temple and on the Sabbath, break that Sabbath, and yet are *blameless*." This remark and assertion only show how easy it is for a man to be mistaken. As before observed, what the priests did on the Sabbath in the temple was in obedience to a divine command—not in violation of any. "Theta's" theory receives no more countenance from the words of our Lord touching the Sabbath service of the priests than it does from the shortest verse in the Bible, which says, "Jesus wept."

3. The third Scripture appealed to by "Theta" is the parable of the laborers in the vineyard. We think he has utterly mistaken the design of this parable. But we have no space to enter upon an exposition of it. Nor is it necessary, since all "Theta's" reasoning upon it has been fully met in a preceding part of this review.

4. The case of the servants, the one beaten "with many," the other with "few stripes" makes nothing for the theory we are opposing. Those chastisements certainly are not admissions or rejections of any class from the Supper, whether immersed or unimmersed. What God may do for the ignorant in another world, is no ground or reason for the church to relax or abolish any divine command on earth, so as to gratify our kind feelings by bringing to the supper those whom the Scriptures exclude from it.

5. The ten lepers. Christ commanded them to go and show themselves to the priest. This command was evidently meant to test their faith, and not to be obeyed; since they were healed before it could be fulfilled. Besides, the place where the lepers met Jesus was in the "midst of Samaria," and one of the nine was a "Samaritan." Luke. xvii: 16. This Samaritan would no more have been received by any Jewish priest than would a Gentile. Yet he was included in the command, "go show yourselves unto the priest." Nor can we suppose that Jesus meant Samaritan priests. But the command, like that to Abraham to slay Isaac, was intended to put their faith to the proof, and not to be obeyed. Hence, "it came to pass that, *as they went*, they were healed." The command to go to the priests was abrogated the moment the miracle was wrought upon them; since being already healed there was no object to be attained by going to the priests. There was, therefore, no disobedience in the case. But the nine who returned not to pour out thanks and gratitude for their healing are, by implication, censured. The case of the lepers is not relevant to "Theta's" position or line of argument.

6. And lastly : "*Will God credit any man for seriously and religiously doing as a command, that which he [God] has not commanded?*" Italics not ours : Quarterly Dec. Really, and in all candor, what has this question to do with unimmersed persons communing in the Lord's Supper? Whether God will or does accept their celebration of the Supper is more than any living man can tell. It is a question not answered in the Scriptures—nor is it even hinted at. Any answer to it that may be given, can have no more authority than that of human opinion, which in this case amounts to no authority at all. Besides, such affirmative speculations have a bad moral tendency in confirming the ignorant, and in keeping alive the old maxim, "all is right if the heart be only right." To argue from disobedience to God's word the acceptance of the disobeying party, is daring and monstrous; and alike dangerous to all classes of persons. The cases cited by "Theta" from the Letter to the Romans, are cases in which there was, and still is, *no law forbidding or commanding*. Here is room for diversity of opinion and conscientious scruple. But this is wholly irrelevant before the three "grand postulates" admitted by "Theta" in the outset. There is an ordained plan of entering the kingdom and of approaching the Supper. If there were no established conditions of entering the church, then "Theta's" argument would be in point; but as it is, it is wholly unsound. But even if, in human opinion, our churches should think with "Theta," still that gives them no power over the terms of entering the church to relax one of them, or to connive at bringing or openly permitting persons to commune who are not contemplated in the Scriptures as communicants in the Supper.

We believe we have now fully met the entire essay of "Theta." In attempting to bring out the consequences of "Theta's" theory we must not be understood as in any sense attributing those consequences to him, as though he held them. We disclaim any such meaning. And in sometimes speaking of inviting or consentingly admitting the unimmersed to commune in our churches, we disclaim any insinuation that "Theta" teaches that our churches ought to do so. The main points before us have been to show, first, that "Theta's" premises are not sound; and second, that our brethren can admit no one to the Supper who has not complied with the Scriptural conditions of entering the church. Between them and such act is the authority of Almighty God.

We may be accused of a want of charity—of excluding good men from the church on earth, and from heaven. We only say that such is not the fact. If we should argue that the unimmersed are in the church, that would not make it a fact. A united vote of the world affirming that they are in the kingdom,

would have no authority in the matter whatever. This is a question to be decided wholly by the word of God; and as "*Theta*" admits that the Scriptures do not contemplate the unimmersed as members or communicants, we say no more. As to what judgment our Heavenly Father will pass on errorists we know nothing, and any speculations of ours are worth nothing. Let us hold to the plain teaching of the sure divine word, and refuse to permit even our affections and sympathies to make us depart from it. A charity which leads away from divine authority, and urges the infraction of commands designed for its perfection, is among the most subtle temptations of Satan. Nor is this temptation designed to ensnare the bad only, but to overcome the best men in the church. Let us in all our decisions be first just to the truth as it is in Jesus—and honor all men, and treat them with gentleness and kindness. The immersed believer is in the kingdom, for God's authority puts him there. He has a right to commune, for divine authority gives him that right. Here the Scriptures cease to speak—and here we close our review. CULLAN.

CULLAN AND ALPHA.—It affords us no common pleasure to publish in the present No. the pieces of Cullan and Alpha. They are old friends and sound, and we delight to afford them space to speak. Their Reviews are noble specimens of the candor and courtesy which should distinguish brethren in their strife for the truth. In discussions like these alone can truth be elicited, and good men be left loving and respecting one another. We like controversy, especially when the bearing and spirit thereof are high and fine, as in these pieces. When such is the case, we say let the battle rage. As to the positions taken by Cullan and Alpha, we believe them to be true and tenable to the last, and wholly irrefutable by *Theta* or any other living man. Replied to they may be without limit, but answered and set aside they never will be. It is high time the loose and ill-digested views of our brethren on the subject of Communing with the sprinkled sects of the day were subjected to criticism. Whether mere sentimentalism or the word of God is to be our guide in this and all like cases, should be known, and known at once. We declare for the word of God, and wage war to the Millennium against every other rule and criterion. We regret the position taken by the gentle *Theta*. It will subject him to life-long explanations, and never can be made to stand the test of sacred writ. In it we see nothing but mischief and ruin. M. E. L.

A REVIEW OF THETA'S REPLY ON COMMUNION.

IN this Reply the question—"Do the unimmersed commune?" is not argued directly, but is determined by another, which is allowed fairly to involve it, viz: Are the unimmersed in the church or kingdom of God? If I have not strangely misunderstood the scope of the Reply, this is a true representation of it, and I think I have not. In other words, it seems, in the Reply, to be granted that if the pious unimmersed are not in the kingdom, then do they not commune. Hence, determine the question, Are they in the kingdom? and the question, Do they commune? is also determined.

If the unimmersed are not in the kingdom, they, as well as we, ought to know it; and the kindest, the most charitable deed on earth, to them, would be to teach them so.

This question, as presented by the Editor, and re-presented by Theta, is confessedly a delicate, if not a difficult one; yet Theta has met and discussed it as a Christian should do. His soul has melted in benevolence over it. His biting sarcasm and subdued wit seem now and then to wound a little, only that the next soft strain might bring the balm that heals. So tenderly does he handle the subject.

As counselor "in the Court of final appeals," he would appear in defense of those who do "the best they can in the circumstances which surround them." Nay, he "stands for them," even here, maintaining that though they may never have obeyed fully the laws of God pertaining to the kingdom here or hereafter, still they will be received with joy, not only into the everlasting kingdom, but also into the church below.

Well may the Reply be characterized as "daring." Where God has appointed neither the counsel nor the counselor, daring indeed must he be who volunteers to give the one and be the other. With me, to sit on the right hand of the Saviour or on his left, or to enjoy any other blessing here or hereafter, is not mine to give. With the Lord we leave the settlement of such questions, assured that the Judge of the whole earth will do right.

On page 201 of the Quarterly, Theta says: "The only question being whether, *according to Scripture*, every soul is absolutely and unalterably shut out of the kingdom, who has not been immersed, regardless of all palliating circumstances." Of this proposition our author takes the negative; that is, he denies a

negative or affirms (omitting unnecessary verbiage) that some unimmersed persons are in the kingdom. This is a question of fact, and may be decided just as any other of the same kind.

The argument of the Reply is—If Luther, taken as an example of the pious unimmersed, was admitted into heaven, in the absence of some of the fixed conditions of entering it, may he not, for a similar reason, have been admitted into the church or kingdom? The conditions of entering heaven being as fixed and well defined as those of admission into the church, and these being relaxed, in the case of Luther, at heaven's gate, it follows, as *Theta* supposes, that by the same benevolent Father the conditions of entering the church are relaxed also. Granting both the suppressed and the expressed premises, does it follow that Luther was in the kingdom? If this conclusion be a truth, let us see what would follow from it; and as this is one of *Theta*'s modes of argumentation, he, at least, will have no reason to object.

1st. If the pious unimmersed are in the kingdom, it would certainly not be wrong for me to so teach—teach them—otherwise, I am forbidden to teach that which is admitted and published to be a truth. But to suppose that I am not allowed to teach the truth, the whole truth, to men in order to their salvation here or hereafter, is monstrous—cannot be true—therefore, I am allowed so to teach them; and not only so, but since it is a truth that the class alluded to is in the kingdom, I am not only *allowed* to teach them so; it is plainly my *duty* to do it. Did our learned brother never preach to the pious unimmersed, take their confession, and baptize them? And for what? If they are already in the kingdom, this whole procedure of our author would seem as strange to me as the lowing of the oxen and the bleating of the lambs did anciently to the Prophet Samuel. The man who sincerely believes them to be in the kingdom, must *leave them where they are*, must not disturb them; for like Abraham when the angel called to him in the land of Moriah, they are just where they ought to be. He wrongs them and wrongs the truth in any effort to lead them now into the green pastures of God's blessed kingdom.

But it may be replied that the person presenting himself for admission confesses by this fact that he is not in the kingdom. All, however, that he *really* does admit is, that he *believes* he is not, and in this faith he is evidently mistaken as per hypothesis; therefore, he is not to be baptized except upon the assumption that the misguided man, in the first instance, had climbed up another way and now wished to climb back again, and enter through the true door into the sheep-fold.

2d. The temple built of dead stones, each prepared for its

place ere it was brought in to the building, was a type of the "church of the living God;" and no stone unprepared was allowed by the master workman to be placed in that beautiful edifice. "See that thou make all things according to the pattern shown to thee in the Mount," was an ancient oracle; and I think that the *principle* is equally applicable when applied to the erection of the spiritual house of God—the church. Now if Luther, &c., were in the kingdom, it follows that God is less concerned about the antitype than he was concerning the mere patterns of things; which it would not be safe nor right to suppose.

3d. If the pious unimmersed are in the kingdom, then God has two modes of induction or doors of entrance.

On the first page of the article under consideration we have it declared by Theta, "that no man can enter the church or kingdom on earth without a birth of water and Spirit." Here is *one* door of the right pattern, heaven-appointed and God-approved. This language is singularly strong and explicit. By *implication* only are we here informed who may be regarded as in the kingdom; but it is by *express* declaration that we are told who may *not* be so regarded.

The pious unimmersed are in the kingdom, as per hypothesis, and yet they, confessedly, entered not by the door above mentioned; hence there are *two* doors. This second door, of late discovery, is, most likely, of the "ram skin and badger skin" pattern, and the discoverer should certainly apply at the next session of the ecclesiastic court having jurisdiction for his patent.

While musing upon the subject of this new door, I am forcibly reminded—and it may seem strange that it is so, but I *am* reminded—of the reply of an evil spirit, once made to some vagabond Jews: "Jesus I know and Paul I know, but who are you?" Acts xix: 15.

I raise no question as to whether John iii: 5, or any other passage, "stands out as an inexorable law, an iron rule that God himself can scarcely manage, even when the circumstances seem to demand it."

The question with me is not, what *can* God do; nor yet, what *does* he do in such cases; but rather, what *must I do?* and do I *know* that God can, consistently, and that he does really relax his law in favor of the honestly misguided, *so far as to receive them into his kingdom?*

Are there any means by which I may distinguish these favored of heaven, that I may know how to treat them and avoid mistreating them?

Of this new door I know nothing. If it be a cognizable truth, it may be reached in one of two ways: either it is an intuition, or it is taught in the holy Scriptures.

I. Is it an intuition? According to one classification of intuitions—which, whether scientifically accurate or not, exhausts the subject—they are divided into intuitions of sense, of consciousness, and of reason.

1st. Is this idea of a *second way* of entering the church or kingdom an intuition of "sense? the faculty of external perception, the faculty which perceives the qualities of external material substances?" The ready answer from every one is, No; therefore, to say more about it would be to say too much.

2d Is it an intuition of the consciousness? "the faculty of internal perception, which perceives and apprehends the operations or phenomena of the mind itself?" I think no one will so contend. Now, if it be not an intuition of *sense* nor of *consciousness*, it is not an intuition at all; for an intuition of reason is but the apprehending of the logical antecedents or consequents, one or both, of the phenomena perceived by *sense* or *consciousness*. But this logical connection could not exist, unless the phenomena alluded to should first exist. These we have *said*, if not shown, do not and cannot exist; hence the idea of a new door into the church of God is not an intuition.

II. Is it taught in the holy Scriptures?

1st. Is it *expressly* taught? Certainly not. The idea is not only not embraced in the *law* of induction, but is, by necessary implication, excluded by an allusion to the law, as before observed. But it is not claimed that the existence of a second door is expressly declared in the Scriptures; hence we may dismiss this part of the subject without further remark.

2d. Is it taught by necessary implication? Remarks on this second division of the question are reserved for another place, where we shall consider the Scriptures referred to in the Reply.

Let it be admitted that Luther, &c., are received into heaven. Upon this concession our learned author makes the following remarks: "Should we now affirm that the same considerations that excused Luther at the gate of heaven, and admitted him in the absence of some of the fixed conditions, may also have excused him at the door of the church, and may have admitted him in absence of some of the regular conditions of initiation there, who could invalidate the argument?" Or, condensing the argument, it stands thus: If some of the fixed conditions of entering *heaven* may be relaxed, so may some of the fixed conditions of entering the church. I grant the antecedent; does the consequent follow? I certainly think it does not. Upon what principle must we allow the consequent? Is it that the compromise is as great in the former case as in the latter, and that God, who, it is admitted, does make the compromise in the one case, does (not may) actually

make it in the other? This is precisely what our essayist does not *know*, and yet must know before he can be certain that his conclusion is true. As God does relax some of the conditions of entering heaven, he *may* relax some of the conditions of entering the church, and he *may not*. Here with the logician the controversy ends. Nay, but it is contended that the compromise at the gate of heaven is even greater than it is here, &c. The compromise, if indeed any is made, is, in either case, one of principle, with which, it would seem to me, the idea of magnitude can have nothing to do. But really did not Luther, when he died, lack, so far as legal preparation is concerned, the same fitness for the church as for heaven, neither more nor less? By the amount that he failed to comply with the terms of induction into, and regulations of, the church here, by so much and no more did he fail of a proper preparation for heaven; and hence the compromise in either case or in both would be the same.

But I insist that the *number* of points in default is not material to the argument—that to violate the law in *one* point is to be guilty of the whole. James ii: 10. How, admitting that Luther was received into heaven, can it be inferred that he was also received into the church, unless it be assumed as a universal principle of God's moral government for both earth and heaven that *he always blesses every one* with the object of his desire who honestly and earnestly seeks it, though his obedience be ever so imperfect. This assumption, however, cannot rightly be made; facts contradict it.

Uzza meant well, at the threshing-floor of Chidon, when "he put forth his hand to hold the ark;" yet "the anger of the Lord was kindled against him."

The young prophet of Judah doubtless meant well when he ate and drank in Bethel contrary to the commandment of God; yet his "carcass did not come into the sepulchers of his fathers."

King Saul meant well, I think, when he saved Agag the king, and a few of the best of the oxen and of the sheep, alive; yet he suffered the penalty of God's violated law. Now, if the principle in question cannot be assumed as a universal one, and manifestly it cannot, it is illogical to conclude that Luther was a citizen of Christ's kingdom, though it be allowed that he, or any number of such persons, was saved in heaven.

The kingdom of heaven, so far as the administration of its affairs on earth is concerned, is in the hands of men, God giving them the law. Our concern should be, "what is written in the law?" If God relaxes, on any account, the conditions of entering the church, the fact is known to *him*, not to *us*; and hence in our administration of the laws of the kingdom we can but hold all

non-conformists as aliens, no matter in what light God himself may regard them. God does most mercifully relax the rigor of his laws of induction into the kingdom, *if at all*, in a way that man may not certainly know, only, it may be, lest man, incompetent to so difficult a task, should attempt similar things himself. The present state of "the church" goes far to vindicate the divine foresight and wisdom in this respect. How eagerly every pretext is seized and embraced for disregarding the landmarks of the highway of holiness. How prone ten thousand tongues to tell that fallen man may rise again, in disregard of some of God's fixed conditions to such an end. 'Tis not charity in me to hug my brother to my bosom, whispering the soothing words "all is well," when I know that in his heart is festering the poison that may kill him.

In the Reply it is insisted that, if Luther was not immersed, he never did, according to the view which the Reply opposes: 1st. Obtain remission of sins. 2d. Enjoy the Holy Spirit. 3d. Become a Christian.

The antecedent of this proposition is, I believe, true—Luther was not immersed; then the consequent, he did not obtain the remission of his sins, &c., must be true, or the entire hypothesis is false.

Does our author admit the consequent? then we are agreed. Does he deny it? then he perpetrates a folly, violating a self-evident rule of hypothetical reasoning. There is just one means of escape from this dilemma, and that is by denying the entire hypothesis. Will he deny that the pardon of sins, the possession of the Holy Spirit, &c., are conditioned upon being immersed? To claim that the unimmersed possess them is to deny that they are conditioned upon it.

But we have the fact staring us in the face that Luther was saved it heaven; and hence, unless he carried his sins to heaven with him, "he must have been pardoned before his death, or at his death, or after he got to heaven, &c." Now suppose I admit the difficulty to be great, so great, indeed, that for it I can find no satisfactory solution; does it follow that the one offered in the Reply is the true one, "that the Heavenly Father, seeing his good intentions and great efforts to serve him, passed over his intellectual mistakes, admitted him into his kingdom here, and took him through the church into heaven?" If Luther *was* taken to heaven, which is not denied, *might* not God have pardoned him at death or even *before death*, without its being *necessary* to conclude that he took him into the kingdom below? For aught our essayist knows to the contrary, he might; and hence it is not established that Luther was taken into the church.

It is admitted that the heathen may be saved; but when, where, or how his sins are pardoned I think is not very certainly known; at least I suppose that it ought not to be affirmed that they are in the church of Jesus Christ. Now does not the case of the heathen present the same difficulty to Theta's mind that he supposed the case of Luther would to the mind of his opponent? But he says of the heathen, that they "are not to be judged by the New Testament." Lurking under the cover of this well timed caveat I think I see a pressing conviction, if not an intentional admission, that the heathen are taken to heaven without passing through the church; that *they*, at least, "walk all along through life just outside the holy place, and then enter the most holy." Why not let Luther travel the same road? Must his case necessarily be determined by the New Testament? Theta, as counselor for Luther, has not hesitated to set aside a part of the New Testament. Why not all of it? Because, doubtless, Luther knew a part of his duty, learned from the New Testament; therefore to this extent he should be judged by it. But another part of his duty he did not learn from the New Testament because of evil influences; hence Theta would excuse him. Now among the things which Luther did not learn was that of being "immersed into Jesus Christ." Luther and the heathen differ only in this: Luther's knowledge of the New Testament was greater than theirs. (Each is responsible for what he knows and can know, and for no more.) In this they are alike: they knew not the way into the kingdom and were not in it. A heathen man is heathen as to the Bible only in so far as he does not and cannot know it. I suggest, in conclusion of this division of the subject, that it is quite as rational to conclude that Luther, though not received into the church, was accepted in heaven, as though he had been.

On page 205 of the Quarterly we have the following question: "*Do the Scriptures teach that God will in any case or for any cause pass by the neglect or violation of his law without bringing on the threatened penalty or withholding the intended blessing?*"

Theta affirms this proposition and so will I. He adduces some passages of Scripture in proof, and I grant that they are unanswerable proof texts. But what do they prove? The question simply, no more, in which there is not the remotest allusion to either baptism or membership in the kingdom of heaven. If it be argued that these Scriptures imply the existence of a principle from which it must necessarily be inferred that Luther and "such like" were received into the church, all that I have to say in reply is, that no such principle can be eliminated from these Scriptures.

The reason why the penalty, in the cases referred to, was not inflicted is not given, and hence they cannot now be quoted by us in justification or extenuation of any like omission of duty or transgression of law. If these Scriptures may be relied upon to prove that the unimmersed are in the kingdom, may they not also prove that persons are in it without any *faith* or *repentance* or any other condition made and provided in the New Testament? Are not infants and idiots on this principle in the kingdom also? The only reason, so far as I can discover, why the law of the kingdom is not binding upon or "does not include infants, idiots, heathen, or any other soul that ought not to be judged by the New Testament," is, that these several parties are incapable, from circumstances which they cannot control, of the specific acts embraced in the law. Luther's incapacity *to enter the kingdom legally* was just as perfect as is the infant's; so if Luther is received I shall appear for the infant, and insist with true Spartan courage, that it be received also.

Let me call the attention of my brother again to the cases of Uzza and Saul, where the penalty of violated law was inflicted. If I should conclude from these Scriptures that God *never* "makes allowance for the unfortunate circumstances" of men, I must think that I would reason as soundly as our author does; yet I should certainly reason fallaciously. All that we may rightly infer from his Scripture references or from mine is, that God does in *some* cases, and usually for unknown reasons, "pass by the neglect or violation of his law," and that in *some* cases he does not.

I note nothing demanding further reply till I come to page 209. Theta says: "Finally, the *end* of the whole system of religion is *love*." Following in the wake of this soft and blessed sentence we find some fine rhetoric, with the conclusion that certain named persons "must have loved, so had a right to commune, could commune, and did commune;" that is whoever loves, is in the kingdom. If I have not greatly misunderstood the Scriptures on the subject of an alien's becoming a citizen of the kingdom, it is true that a man must *love* with all his heart *before* he enters. Now if a man may love God *before* he enters the kingdom, the mere possession of love is not conclusive proof that he is in it. Many may love God to divine acceptance who keep not his commandments; but with me, "This is the love of God that we keep his commandments." 1st John v: 3, et al. While, therefore, *God* may see that some men love him who keep not his commandments, *I* am not authorized to see it so; much less am I authorized to predicate any action of mine upon such a supposition.

ALPHA.

ΙΩΑΝΝΗΣ Ο ΒΑΠΤΙΣΤΗΣ.

JOHN THE BAPTIST.

[The body of the following article was written by a valued friend more than a year ago. At present, therefore, it may seem a little out of date. It is now published, however, because of the bearing it has on the important subject to which it relates. That subject has not lost its value to the public, hence this article should not be allowed to perish.]

The first fruits of the Revision, the final Revision, we mean, of the Holy Scriptures in English, by the Bible Union, have been for some time before the public in a little volume containing the four Gospels. In one particular, however, it does not seem that we are, in all confidence, to regard this part of the New Testament as final. We refer to the words at the head of this article.

When the primary revision of Matthew, from the hand of Dr. Conant, was published, much surprise was excited by the fact that while βαπτίζω, βάπτισμα, and βαπτισμός were uniformly translated, the noun βαπτιστής was transferred, thus standing the solitary monument of the long past of this family of Greek words in the English Scriptures. Much discussion, sometimes severe, was elicited on this point. For our own part, from a full examination of the matter, and the consequent certain conviction that there was not a single good ground for the revisor to support this single and singular exception, we rested in the full hope that the final committee would overrule the revisor and translate this word also. This hope was not altogether realized. In the short preface to the final revision now published we are informed that "there is a difference of opinion among the members of the committee in regard to the substitution of '*the immerser*' for '*the baptist*.' In the view of a part of the committee, if the verb which expresses the Christian rite is translated, the official title derived from it should be translated also. Others object to this as an inconsistency in a revision which transfers other official titles, as '*the Christ*,' instead of '*the Anointed*,' and as leading to confusion and inconvenience by substituting new and unknown names of historical personages for those by which they are universally known in English usage. This word, though employed in this edition, is subject to further consideration by the committee."

This, then, leaves the question still unsettled, and suggests a possible return, at some day, to the first revisor's position. In full harmony with the liberal character of the Bible Union, seeking all possible light on all points in the work of revision, we

propose to review this question, not overlooking, of course, the discussion it has already called forth.

We shall turn our attention first to the position taken by Dr. Conant, who, we believe, is the primary revisor of Matthew, to justify the non-translation of the word βαπτιστής.

As to the importance of this matter, it being a prominent part of the word of God, we trust that no enlightened, earnest Christian can have a moment's doubt. We furthermore hesitate not, in the outset, to say that we believe the question before us can be, and ought to be, made clear to the understanding of all.

In the first revision, then, the word βαπτιστής has, in its English form, been retained, while βαπτίζω, βάπτισμα, and βαπτισμός, have been uniformly represented by *immerse* and *immersion*. This remarkable exception to the rule adopted for the other two words has justly aroused general attention and excited much surprise. Is the revisor justified? is the inquiry that came from all quarters where men were interested in the work of the Bible Union.

The position of the revisor, in his notes to Matt. iii: 1, and iv: 1, is that βαπτιστής is a surname used, as we understand him, merely to distinguish John from others of the same name. Let us examine this, as it is the chief, if not the only argument offered, for retaining this word. The point fully stated in the note to Matt. iv: 1, is, that if ὁ διάβολος were rendered "the Traducer" instead of "the Devil," or σατανᾶς, "Adversary," instead of "Satan," the reader would be confused and at a loss to know to whom these terms referred. Leaving these terms out of the discussion, we simply answer, that, so far as this reasoning applies to the case before us, it is without force, and for the following reasons:

First. This person already has a proper name, John, by which he is known and recognized throughout the historical books of the New Testament, and throughout the eighteen centuries of the Christian history. Further, he is known throughout the New Testament *chiefly* by this name *alone*. In Matthew, Mark, and Luke the name occurs altogether sixty-three times, and only fourteen times with βαπτιστής; in John (twenty times) and Acts (nine times) this "surname" never occurs at all. This shows clearly that the word βαπτιστής was not necessary simply as a surname to distinguish this John from others of the same name. Will any one say that in these seventy-eight cases in which the person is designated *only* by the name John, there is "obscurity and darkness" (see note Matt. iv) as to who is meant? If so, the charge falls back upon the Holy Spirit whose work this is. The same is true, in a good degree, both in earlier and later writers of the Christian church, in whose writings the Harbinger is very often known by the simple name John. Now, can the learned revisor

show that all this, in and out of the canon, has ever produced "darkness and confusion?"

The only point Dr. Conant can be understood to make for his case, is that the word in question is a surname without any regard whatever to its meaning; that its meaning is of little or no consequence. In other words, that it is like Mark, the surname of John, the apostle, in which there is, in the New Testament, no designed significance. The moment the revisor grants that it is a significant surname, given by the Holy Spirit or accepted with the intent that it shall speak its meaning to all that read it, that moment his argument for not translating it falls to the ground. Now we venture to declare, in all confidence, that from what has been already said it is clear that the word "Baptist" is not so used throughout the New Testament as a mere necessary surname, whose meaning is of no weight.

But let us now approach nearer to this question of the significance of this "surname." There may be, and are, cases in sacred and profane history where surnames were not translated, either because their meanings were of no moment, or because they were well understood in the languages to which they were transferred; or finally, because the word in its original adoption, was so entirely changed from its common noun or adjective form, as to cease to be a significant appellative altogether, but became actually a proper name. The word before us, however, belongs to none of these classes. Its *form* suffered no such change, but is that of a common Greek noun, and is one of the most numerous and translatable in the Greek language—of which more hereafter. Again, the word does not readily suggest its meaning in the languages foreign to the Greek, as is the English. To the revisors and other friends of the Bible Union we need not repeat that the βαπτίζω family is *not* understood in its English forms in the English world. The revisor of Matthew has abundantly proved his conviction of the truth of this in translating every word of this family, saving the single word under discussion. Nor is it true that its meaning is of no consequence. This appellative was given to John to designate and distinguish him in the great act of his mission, which was to immerse men into repentance, &c. God sent him to immerse. And shall we say that a divinely applied descriptive name, embodying the great act and purpose of his mission—the name by which he is introduced in the New Testament, the Immerser, is to be made by us of so little moment that we may throw its import away altogether for the whole after world? Surely it is hard to see how any one can be brought to such a conclusion. Yet—we repeat it with regret—such is the real position of the revisor of Matthew, and of those of the final

committee that agree with him. This appellative designates John and makes him renowned as the introducer and administrator, even in the immersion of the Son of God, of that blessed ordinance with which his name is connected throughout the whole New Testament history and the after history of the church; and this glorious office of John is everywhere treated as of great consequence. The word βαπτιστής was intended to *teach* men the office and work of John. This is clear from the word itself; but it is further clear from the fact that in Mark vi: 14, this word exchanges with βαπτίζων, the present active participle, which the revisor himself seems to think ought to be translated: so at least we understand him. Yet this latter participial form is no more common and definite in its meaning than the former—the two really meaning substantially the same; as the *speaking one* and the *speaker* mean the same. Therefore the latter form has always been translated like the former, in every version, ancient or modern, so far as we know. The revisor of Matthew is the first person we have found who makes a distinction—a distinction, in our humble judgment, altogether unauthorized.

But to assume that because Josephus, writing in Greek, says John was "surnamed the Baptist," he was therefore called Baptist in every other language, Syriac, Arabic, Coptic, &c., &c., is certainly, to say the least of it, a very extraordinary conclusion. What other word Josephus could have used as appropriately we cannot see. He wrote in Greek, and βαπτιστής is the Greek word that precisely designates the work of John. But that he would have used the same word had he written in the common Hebrew, or that he means to say, that in all the different languages around, the word βαπτιστής was applied to John, is a conclusion, we repeat, wholly unwarrantable from Josephus' words. If the fact be so, it must be learned from other sources. And will the revisor tell us that this Greek appellative was actually retained, for example, in the Arabic and Syriac languages, in their versions of the New Testament or their other religious writings? This must be so if there is any force in the revisor's quotation from Josephus. We believe, however, this is not the case in these languages; both the verb and nouns are translated. Josephus simply says he was surnamed the Baptist. The word επικαλούμενος—surnamed—does not imply that βαπτιστής became a name in other tongues, or that the appellative is not to be translated. For example, we have a distinguishing appellative given to James, namely, James the Less. Mark xv: 40. This is just such an appellative as the revisor indicates—one that was to distinguish this apostle from another of the same name. Now who would infer and argue from this that μικρός—small—was not to be translated but transferred, as we do

a word of the opposite meaning in Charlemagne? But is this *μικρός* a case of *επικαλούμενος*? Certainly; and that, too, of much less meaning and real consequence than *βαπτιστής*. We happen to have in Xenophon's *Memorabilia* of Socrates just such a case: Aristodemus *τον μικρόν επικαλούμενον*—*surnamed the Little*. Here is the very word used in Josephus. Does any one pretend to translate this—Aristodemus surnamed the *Micros*? or assume that the author means to say that this man was so called, and ought to be so called, in all other tongues? Surely not; and cases of this kind might be multiplied. If we were to adopt the rule the revisor applies to the passage in Josephus, it would lead to very singular results in translations.

But suppose we allow, for the moment, all that the revisor desires to make out of this passage in Josephus, that in the days of Josephus the people speaking other tongues, as well as the Greek, had chosen to use the term Baptist as a cognomen of John. What would this amount to? The people of that day did, as have all following generations done, just such unwarrantable things. It would have been an act without the slightest authority for the translator of the word of God, as it would be an act without the least divine sanction. A true method of interpretation and translation has nothing whatever to do with any *such* outside uses or abuses of New Testament words. This is no part of that *usus loquendi* which is authoritative with us. To adopt such a license would lead to the most wild and injurious results. It would utterly forbid the translation of the words which the Bible Union revisors have translated, and which in other languages have been translated. If a humanly consecrated use of Bible words is to be a law for us, why translate baptize, bishop, Easter, deacon, &c., &c.? It is strange to us that this grave error should have been permitted in the Bible Union publications; we mean that a revisor in the bosom of the Bible Union should have committed this error, and been sustained by a part of the final committee. We desire to repeat it with all earnestness, no such outside influence as the revisor would here bring in must be allowed to bear on the sacred word. It would be subjecting the supreme, immutable divine, to the capricious, changeful human. The Bible alone is the norma of its interpretation and translation. When the positive, designed, New Testament meanings of its words are determined, we are not to modify them in an iota according to any possible use that men may have made of them. We must prefer God to man, the divine authority to the whole burden of human prejudices. Human languages in their most ancient usages must yield to the necessity of divine, saving truth. Even the idioms of languages, so much cherished and so tena-

ciously contended for, must yield, as Ernerti has so truthfully observed, to this divine necessity. 'Ο βαπτιστής means, and in the divine word, by God's authority, is *intended* to mean, something, and did carry a very important meaning to every Greek to whom it came; and we protest that no abuse of it by any men, ancient or modern, has any authority to induce us to make it mean nothing, or anything else than its real full import. This applies to what is said about English usage in the extract from the preface to the edition of the four Gospels, quoted at the beginning of this article. And the revisor himself stands with us here and against himself. In his note on Matthew iv: 1, he says that ὁ διάβολος was applied to the chief of the fallen spirits "*as a designation of his character and work,*" and makes it a case parallel to ὁ βαπτιστής. Right! but if this, then, is so designed of God, what justification is there for making this latter word of no full and clear significance to the world, but covering it up in doubt and darkness to them, that they shall not learn from it the "character and work" of John? Let us have this answered.

The great and glorious rule of the Bible Union is, that to our best ability the translations shall be made to speak to all the nations of the earth to-day precisely what the divine original said to the Greeks of the apostolic day. To the Greeks the words baptizo, baptisma, baptismos, baptistes, were words of like meaning, and perfectly intelligible. Who can deny this? Is this true of the primary revision of Matthew? Who can affirm it? And is it because we know the meaning of the first three but not of the last? Or is it because our language affords words for the former but not for the latter? No one will affirm this.

The history of the translation of these four words is, that where the verb is translated the nouns are always translated, including baptistes. This is true of every translation, ancient or modern, we know of. The Latin, for example, with its daughters, the Italian, Spanish, French, and Portuguese, transfers all these words. So does the English, with some others. The Anglo-Saxon, on the contrary, and the Germanic tongues of to-day, translate them all. This we learn is also true of the ancient Asiatic translations. We presume this revision of Matthew stands alone in its anomalous course on this point in the whole history of translations from the apostolic day to the present. This alone should have awakened serious reflections and misgivings on the part of the revisor.

The character of the Greek word under discussion, in its particular form and meaning, is another not unimportant point in the discussion of this question. As we intend to make this matter clear to the common reader, we trust we shall be pardoned

for stating here what is well known to the scholar. We say, then, that the character of the word *baptistes* demands a translation for it, and makes it one of the most translatable in the Greek language. It belongs to one of the most abundant classes of common nouns, and has nothing whatever in its form and meaning that could make it unusual, or difficult of translation. The class of nouns to which it belongs is chiefly derived from verbs, and denotes simply the *doer* of the act indicated by the verb. The terminations of this very numerous class are *es*, *er*, and *or*—the three being equivalent in meaning, and imply precisely what two of these same terminations yet retained in English still mean in our tongue. These nouns have the same relation to the verbs from which they are derived, as the word *doer* has to the verb *do*, *speaker*, to *speaking*, *actor*, to *act*, &c., &c. From this very simple statement every one can see both the ease and the importance of the translation of this word. If the verb *baptizo* is retained this noun should be represented by *baptizer*, and so it was represented by Tyndale. If the verb is translated *immerse*, the noun becomes *immerser*. This is just the way these words have been treated in the translations in the German tongues, where the same law of terminations holds good. Now as numerous, as plain, as important, as is this class of nouns in *er* in English, so numerous, so plain, so important, is the corresponding class to which *baptistes* belongs in Greek. The noun *immerser* after the verb *immerse* is no more novel than the noun *reader* after the verb *read*. Furthermore, it denotes action, therefore, character, and is not a mere unmeaning unimportant surname, simply to distinguish one man from another, as James Smith and John Smith distinguish two members of the same family, neither they, their parents, nor anybody else caring what the surname in the case means. Yet, we fear, to this level, without designing it, the revisor would bring the word *baptistes*. It is precisely the action indicated in this word that does distinguish, and is designed to distinguish, the harbinger of Christ—not *only from all other Johns but from all other men of whatever name of every age*. This is the full truth in the case. This greatest of ante-Messianic men, we presume, would have been so called had no other John existed then. Fail to translate this word to the common reader, and this most significant word historically, becomes an unmeaning appendage to the name of the great Reformer, as unmeaning as it is to-day in France, Italy, and elsewhere, where John-Baptist is one of the commonest names. Archbishop Purcell wears it, and what does it signify to the Catholics of his diocese? Nothing; but just as much as it would signify untranslated in the New Testament; translate it in both cases, and imagine the difference of effect.

But we go further; we hesitate not to affirm, that in this respect the common version has altogether the advantage of the revision. As the words baptize and baptism are scattered all over the New Testament, it is no very difficult matter for an unprejudiced mind to learn the meanings of these words from the uses made of them where they occur. From this it will be easy to understand the meaning of baptist. As far as baptize and baptism have any significance to any man, so far they will explain to him baptist. But in this revision the word baptist stands solitary, friendless, and alone, its kindred, its verb and cognate noun forms, that served hitherto to give it countenance and explanation, having entirely disappeared, and not one word left in the whole Bible to throw one ray of light on this lonely, hoary monument of departed centuries. The revisor who has swept away the words baptize and baptism has no right to presume for succeeding generations, nor even for the people of the present day, a knowledge of the proper meaning of the word baptist. By rejecting the words baptize and baptism he positively declares that in the current use of these words their true meaning is not revealed; if not, they give a false one. But the English speaking people will always interpret baptist by baptize. The New Testament is intended for the unlearned as well as the learned. No one has a right to assume that hereafter the reader of the revised Scriptures will be at pains to compare baptize with immerse, or that he will bring the word baptize at all into his reading and studying of the New Testament. The translator has a right to rely on the holy page itself alone, for the proper understanding of it by the people in their vernacular. The man, therefore, who has either a false knowledge of the word baptize, or no knowledge of it at all, must inevitably remain either wholly ignorant of the meaning of this appellative of John, which was so very clear to the commonest Greek that read it, or retain an utterly erroneous notion of it. This is the predicament in which this revisor leaves the general reader. Once more upon this point. As long as the term baptize is retained, there is reasonable ground for retaining also the word baptist. But if the former be cast out from the Holy Scriptures, and, as it ought then to be, from our ordinary religious discourse, then the latter, having no kindred word to sustain or explain it, will be known only as the name of a religious party, as is even now the case with thousands in the English world, and as is universally the case in the German world. And men carry this, their meaning, gathered outside of the New Testament, into it, and so accept the word in the case of John. Let no man affect to overlook this; it is among the commonest of probabilities. God in his revealed

word has to deal with a very ignorant and misguided world. The least obscuration of the beams of divine light has the saddest of consequences in the benighted minds and hearts of men. Let no man for a moment imagine that we would design to insinuate that the word under discussion is retained in the revision for denominational benefit. Far be it from us to do this. By such judgments we may do men the deepest wrongs, which, we thank God, we find neither in our head nor heart to do. We accept this revisor's reasons as he has given them, and deal with them upon their own merits. It is with the translation and not with the revisor or his motives that we have to do. This alone is just and in harmony with the demands for criticism the Bible Union has made. We believe, and rejoice to believe, that there are thousands of pious and intelligent Baptists, both among the friends and opponents of the Bible Union, who would denounce such a motive for retaining this word, or such an ignorant, false, mere denominational acceptance of it as we have indicated. With the ignorant men and bigots among the Baptists—and such are everywhere—who would justify both such a false motive and such an abuse of this word, we have nothing to do. We have made this point because it is of consequence, and we desire the reader to keep it in mind, as we shall refer to it again before we conclude this article.

There is another very important result that would follow to the Bible Union, by its adoption of the conclusion of the revisor of Matthew in regard to this word, but to which, so far as we know, no allusion has yet been made anywhere in the discussion of this question. Let it be distinctly understood that this conclusion is not, that "Baptist" should be retained in the *English* Scriptures alone. This of course would be too absurd to be for a moment entertained. The conclusion covers all translations. The revisor holds that Baptist became and remained a proper surname, not to be translated in the New Testament century, and therefore never afterwards. This is the scope of the argument. If the Bible Union then ever adopts this view, it becomes a rule for all its revisions and translations; for the great principle of this institution, which characterizes it and distinguishes it from all other similar institutions, and to which it owes its very existence, is, "the Bible faithfully translated into all the languages of earth," that is, one uniform rule for all translations. These being the premises, what result must follow? There are a number of translations, as in the Germanic tongues, for example, read by many millions for centuries, in which all the words of the *baptizo* family are accurately and uniformly translated. Now if the above conclusion is adopted by the Bible Union, then in its revisions of the Ger-

man and other Teutonic versions—and such revisions in time it must make, and intends to make—these long pre-existing translations of *baptistes*, though acknowledged accurate, and familiar to the people, will have to be destroyed, and in their stead introduce this Greek “surname,” a word entirely foreign to these languages, and altogether unknown to those people in the New Testament sense, being there known *only*, where it is known at all, as the name of the American and English Baptist denomination. This would force the Bible Union to repudiate its high pretences, and bring its glorious purposes to shame and confusion, by retrograding even beyond the centuries-old translations, by untranslating what is truly rendered, and shrouding in darkness again the light of God’s word which the people have for centuries enjoyed. What a fall, what a descent from the noble elevation of arguments, of aims, and labors, occupied by the men of the Bible Union for the last thirteen years! And will any man deny the correctness of our conclusion? And is this not a serious matter to the Bible Union? Does it not involve an utter abnegation of its great and glorious principle of strength and triumph? In the next place, how would the great German world, with its vast learning, meet such a demand to yield up its *Johannes der Taeufer*, a universally known, full, and exact translation of the Greek; to blot it out of their Bible, and accept in its place a term wholly unknown in their language, except as a denominational term, and that even unknown to hundreds of thousands; to yield up light for darkness, knowledge for ignorance, to retrograde in respect to this term to the dark ages; to trample upon the great word of Luther—“give the Bible to people in their own tongue which they can understand”—how, I say, is the German world expected to meet such a demand? I will not say with what indignation they would reject it. The revisor himself must know what a terrible rebuke such an attempt would receive at their hands. The Germanic world would never receive it. They would regard it as an effort to introduce and sanctify among them by means of the word of God, a name known to them, as we have said, only as the name of a foreign religious party just beginning to establish itself among them. We are far from saying that such is the purpose of the revisor or the Society. We do not believe it is. But such would be inevitably the result. Is the Bible Union ready thus to sacrifice its noblest principle? Is it willing by this sad error to be forced into a deplorable and fatal retrogression back through centuries? We sincerely trust not.

Let no man say this is but a single word. It has been the boast and high argument of the Bible Union that every word shall stand out in the fullness of its original light; that if but one

word of the Holy Spirit can be rescued from darkness and brought into light it is a blessed work, a work of holy duty to do it, and knowingly to hide the meaning of but a single word is an offense against God's holy truth which is for the saving of the nations. Such were the words and sentiments of the departed Cone and others, who strove nobly to inaugurate the enterprise of the Bible Union; and we pray to God that these sentiments and deep and earnest purposes may yet triumph, and that this institution, ever so dear to us, may yet fulfill its mission to the glory and praise of God.

What we have said in this article we have said from a strict sense of duty, and not in a spirit of sectarian cavil. We have waited long and patiently to hear and think before speaking out before the public. This is the great crisis, the realization of hopes and fears in the work of the Bible Union, now as the final revisions are about to be issued, as they are to stand for the future. A full and free criticism is indispensable to duty and to the success of the truth. With such views and feelings we offer what we have written to the public, and especially to the brethren who have, under God, the work of revision in the Bible Union immediately in their hands, fervently praying that God may mercifully grant to lead us into all his holy truth.

LAMBDA.

KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY.—It is with sincere regret we have learned that the buildings of this institution have been burned. The whole State should feel deep pain at the calamity; and as one man should rise up to repair the loss on the most magnificent scale. Now that the subject of rebuilding is before the Curators, they should patiently and profoundly consider the question of the best site. *Is Harrodsburg the place?* Candidly we cannot think it; and we have not so much as even one personal interest to say this. That Lexington is the place where the University should stand is a proposition having for us the force of a simple intuition. Put the question to Kentucky and this will be her voice. We hope that no mere local or personal considerations will be allowed to influence the decision; and that when it is made every brother in the State will acquiesce and work accordingly.

HYMNS AND HYMN BOOKS.

"PSALMS AND HYMNS ADAPTED TO SOCIAL, PRIVATE, AND PUBLIC WORSHIP IN THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES."

"A COLLECTION OF HYMNS FOR PUBLIC, SOCIAL, AND DOMESTIC WORSHIP." PUBLISHED UNDER THE INDORSEMENT OF SIX BISHOPS OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, SOUTH.

"THE PSALMIST: A NEW COLLECTION OF HYMNS FOR THE USE OF BAPTIST CHURCHES."

"THE CHRISTIAN HYMN BOOK."

It is well known to a large circle of brethren that there is a strong and increasing demand among us for a new hymn book, or a greatly improved edition of the old one. It is alleged against the old book that it is deficient in arrangement, in variety and poetic excellence of the hymns, and in variety of size, material, and finish. Whether these allegations are just or unjust, the demand for something new is likely to develop some practical results very soon, and it becomes all thoughtful brethren to give the subject very careful consideration.

The circulation and use of several different hymn books would not imply a schism among the churches; for use of the same hymn book is not made an element of church unity by the word of God. Still, the inconvenience of such an arrangement would be very great, and the tendency of it would be towards evil. It would be inconvenient to preachers in passing from one church to another, and still more so to assemblages of brethren from churches where different books were in use. It would also be likely to engender strife in some of the churches, parties being formed in favor of the different books; and still more likely to engender an unpleasant rivalry, if not downright jealousy, among the different publishers and proprietors. All these are evils which should be most carefully avoided. Rather than encounter any of them, we could much better afford to content ourselves for a long time with an inferior collection of hymns.

There are certain essential elements of a good hymn book which must be recognized before we are prepared to pronounce upon the merits of any work of the kind. They furnish a number of corresponding rules by which the comparative merits of hymn books must be determined, and by which compilers should be governed. In the statement and application of these rules we can best develop the principles on which they depend. We propose to lay them before the brethren as a guide both to reflection and action upon the subject.

1. The first and most essential of these rules is this: *A Hymn*

book should be entirely free from unscriptural sentiments and phraseology. No excellence in any one or in all other particulars can atone for serious deficiency in this. A book which goes into the hands of all alike, from the oldest to the youngest, from the wisest to the most ignorant, and which in some measure forms the religious conceptions while it expresses the emotions of the great masses, *must* be made to speak the truth. A false or unscriptural utterance here strikes upon the soul in its most susceptible moments, and is so impressed by the power of music that it remains almost indelible, and works its injurious effects through life. Better sacrifice taste and poetry and convenience and everything, than sacrifice truth and fidelity to the word of God.

2. The second rule, in rank of importance, requires *that the hymns possess the highest attainable degree of poetic excellence.* No other hymns can remain permanently popular, or make a lasting impression on the soul. Many persons imagine that the highest order of lyric poetry is adapted only to cultivated taste; but this involves a misconception of the nature of poetry. It is the peculiar glory of true poetry that it speaks with like effect to all ages, classes, and conditions of men. It speaks to the heart of man as man, and therefore overleaps all geographical lines, all national distinctions, and even the lapse of ages. The songs which thrilled the hearts of ancient Greeks and Romans are still the delight of classic students in every country, and psalms of praise which made vocal the walls of Jerusalem three thousand years ago are still sung with rapture in every language of the civilized world. They cheer the rudest cot of the peasant, while they are not despised in the palaces of kings. The great cathedrals of Europe and the rude log meeting houses of the western world are equally familiar with their strains.

In confirmation of this rule, we find that those hymns which are universal favorites, which find their way into all hymn books, and become household words in every family, are all of the very highest order of lyric poetry. For example, the three most familiar songs in every church and every family in the western world are probably those commencing "O thou fount of every blessing," "Am I a soldier of the cross," and "Since I can read my title clear." A stranger traveling through the country may sing either of these in any religious assembly, with confidence that he will be followed by a good chorus of voices, though there be not a hymn book in the house. They are among the earliest songs which children learn to sing; and they thrill the hearts of aged saints as scarcely any other words or music can. Often, when a child, have I laid awake at night and listened to these strains as they came faintly to my ear from a distant apartment,

where my mother's voice was soothing the spirit of a younger child, and it appeared to my young heart like a sound from the heavenly world. Often, too, in my solitary walks, or in lonely rides across the wide prairies of the west, have I lifted my own voice upon these inspiring words, and felt, like Jacob of old, in the very presence of God. Still oftener have I heard them in the great congregation, when deep emotions of soul would soften into harmony all discordant voices, and the tear-drop trembling in the eye would tell how the heart responded to every thought. What gives them this peculiar power to possess the soul but their poetic excellence—the harmony of their numbers, the beauty of their imagery, and the loftiness of their conceptions? And where can nobler lyrics be found? For the smoothness with which its numbers flow, and for just that frequency and propriety of metaphor which is necessary to give vividness to the thought; it would be difficult to find a finer poem than "O the fount of every blessing," especially this inimitable stanza:

"O to grace how great a debtor
Daily I'm constrained to be!
Let thy goodness, like a fetter,
Bind me closer still to thee."

Not inferior to this in harmony, and much more highly figurative, is the song "Am I a soldier of the cross." Every line of this clarion-like call to the great battle of life is vivid with metaphors which come leaping upon the imagination like armed warriors from the spirit land. The climax of courage and hope is attained when the heroes of the cross exclaim,

"Thy saints, in all this glorious war,
Shall conquer though they die.
They see the triumph from afar,
And seize it with their eye."

But there is nothing in all the range of lyric poetry superior to the closing stanza of that most familiar of all hymns, "Since I can read my title clear." After bringing the heir of glory, by anticipation, through all the conflicts with earth and hell, through "cares like a wild deluge," and through "storms of sorrow," to his home, his God, his heaven, his all, the poet makes him exclaim:

"There shall I bathe my weary soul
In seas of heavenly rest;
And not a wave of trouble roll
Across my peaceful breast."

We say no more at present of our second rule. The reader will readily admit that its observance is entirely necessary to the compilation of a good hymn book.

3. In the third place, to answer well its purpose a hymn book *must embody a great variety of topics*. This is necessary in order that the singing of a congregation may be adapted to every different occasion, and to all the Scriptural subjects discussed in the

pulpit. There is nothing more inharmonious than for a preacher to select, just previous to his discourse, a hymn on a subject entirely different from that to which he intends to invite the attention of his audience, or for the chorister, at the conclusion of a discourse on prayer, to sing a song on the resurrection of the dead.

Let it not be understood that this rule involves the necessity of a very large hymn book. The number of hymns extant, on all the varieties of Scriptural subjects, which will stand the test of our first two rules, is far more limited than most persons imagine. Any man qualified to judge, who will open the most select hymn book in use, and, beginning on the first page, proceed to throw out every hymn that contains unscriptural sentiments or phraseology, and every one that does not possess genuine poetic excellence, will be astonished to find how rapidly the book is reduced in size. Without having made a very accurate calculation, we venture the proposition that there are not many more than five hundred hymns in all the collections extant that will stand the test which we have above prescribed; and we may include in this number all those which are good poems and could be pruned of unscriptural sentiments by slight verbal alterations. If any man doubts this, all we ask of him is that he will investigate the subject sufficiently to form a well grounded opinion. If our estimate is correct, even proximately so, we can have a collection of hymns embracing all of a superior order which have yet been composed, without the necessity of a very large volume.

4. Our fourth rule has reference to the arrangement of the hymns. It requires, in addition to the index of first lines, *such an arrangement as will readily point out every hymn by its subject-matter*. This may be accomplished in part by arranging the hymns in the body of the work according to their subjects, and supplying a general index of subjects. This arrangement is good so far as it goes, but it is not sufficient; for many hymns are adapted to a variety of subjects and occasions, and when arranged under one heading they are detached from another to which they are equally appropriate. There should, therefore, be a *complete index of subjects*, embracing every topic and every proper occasion to which each hymn within the book is adapted. It would require no little study and skill to arrange such an index; but when arranged, it would be invaluable to every one whose business it is to make selections of hymns.

5. The fifth and last rule which we will prescribe is that a hymn book *should be adapted to proper variety of taste, age, and usage*. The first refers to the style of binding. In reference to both cheapness and costliness there is a proper limit. A hymn book

should never be bound in gaudy style; for this would cultivate pride in the house of God; neither should it be bound in flimsy style, for it becomes a familiar friend and should last a long time. The second and third points of adaptation depend upon the size of the type. There should be at least two sets of plates, so as to furnish a large type for old eyes and for use in dimly lighted rooms, and a small type for young persons and for convenience as a pocket edition.

A book which is marked in the highest degree by these five points of excellence is the best hymn book, and will inevitably supersede every other with a well informed and truly religious people. He who would pronounce a just judgment upon the merits of existing books, who would compile a new one, or would improve an old one, must be guided by these rules, having proper reference to their relative importance, if he would meet with success.

That we may give a still more practical bearing to our remarks, we propose now a very brief examination into the comparative merits of our old hymn book, in the light of these rules.

In reference to the most important of them all, truthfulness of sentiment and correspondence to Scripture phraseology, our book is incomparably superior to all others in popular use. This will be questioned by no brother who is informed in the premises. All the sectarian hymn books of the day are full of sectarian theology. We might sustain this allegation by an abundance of quotations from them all; but it is sufficient for our present purpose to present a few specimens from those three which are commonly reputed the most orthodox, and which are in the most general use among the people.

First, then, the Presbyterian hymn book. It sings the praises of all the doctrines peculiar to the Presbyterian church, and to Calvinism in general. Among them we note the doctrine of predestination, justification by faith only, abstract operations of the Holy Spirit, worship of the Spirit, final perseverance, despondency, total depravity, infant sprinkling, and even "baptism in the place of circumcision." We will occupy space only to present choice specimens under a few of these headings. From the lyrics on predestination we select the following; one of the most unambiguous stanzas, if not the most poetical, that I can find:

"Predestinated to be sons,
Born by degrees, but chose at once,
A new regenerated race,
To praise the glory of his grace."

The abstract operation of the Holy Spirit is set forth under a great variety of images, of which the following stanza presents

one of the most poetical, while the words are ingeniously conformed to a well known passage in the English Scriptures:

"The Spirit, like some heavenly wind,
Blows on the sons of flesh;
Remodels all the carnal mind,
And forms the man afresh."

But notwithstanding the thoroughly remodeling effect of this heavenly wind upon the souls of the orthodox, unlike any other wind, it is so impalpable that you can never be very certain that it really did blow. The same congregation, therefore, which sings of it so experimentally at one time, also sings at times under the head of "Despondency," the well known hymn beginning with these lines:

"'Tis a point I long to know,
Oft it causes anxious thought;
Do I love the Lord, or no;
Am I his, or am I not?"

But the poetic genius of Presbyterianism is not limited to themes like these. So vigorous and buoyant are its powers that it finds inspiration even in the sprinkling of an infant. Among the notes which it sounds in connection with the celebration of this ordinance of man, is the following:

"Thus Lydia sanctified her house,
When she received the word;
Thus the believing jailer gave
His household to the Lord."

There now! Who will ever deny, after that, that Lydia's infants, and the jailer's too, were "dedicated to the Lord in baptism?" The hymn book says so; and the hymn book, you know, is next to the Bible.

But this most doctrinal of all the hymn books is not content with thus singing, as infallible truth, manufactured Scripture; it goes into the detail of the doctrine, and tells us how it is that water came to be used in the dedication of infants. It sings:

"Abraham believed the promised grace,
And gave his son to God;
But water seals the blessing now,
That once was sealed with blood."

This must suffice as an exhibition of the doctrinal character of the Presbyterian hymn book. It is the most doctrinal of the three collections whose merits we are endeavoring to estimate; and for this very reason it contains the greatest amount of false doctrine. It is no wonder that a church which thus trains its members to *sing* all its peculiar errors, should be more inaccessible to the truth than most others, and should exhibit a striking illustration, if not of the final perseverance of the saints, at least of the final perseverance of Presbyterians.

Methodism, as compared with Presbyterianism, is far less doctrinal, and proportionably more emotional. We find this distinction pervading their respective hymn books. Though less doc-

trinal, however, and though carefully avoiding all the peculiar doctrines of the Calvinistic school, the Methodist collection is intensely orthodox on those two standing tests of orthodoxy, Direct Spiritual Influence, and Justification by Faith only. It contains the most popular of the hymns upon these subjects found in other books, and has some peculiarly its own, which are the result of Methodist enthusiasm. Of the latter class, we find one commencing thus :

" Lord God, the Holy Ghost,
In this accepted hour,
As on the day of Pentecost,
Descend in all thy power."

The term *Holy Ghost*, a most shocking title for the Holy Spirit, is peculiarly adapted to the wild imagination of Methodists, and abounds in this hymn book more than in any other. They can see in their revivals, and in the uproar of their more "precious seasons of grace," nothing less than a repetition of the scenes of Pentecost. In the above hymn they pray for this, and in another, which supposes the prayer to be answered, each stanza closes with this couplet :

" All hail the day of Pentecost,
The coming of the Holy Ghost."

The doctrine of justification by faith only, is very distinctly avowed in the Methodist creed, and is perhaps more persistently proclaimed by Methodist preachers than by any other body of preachers in the world. It is but consistent, therefore, that they should sing it in most unambiguous terms; so thought, at least, some poet among them, and the board of bishops have indorsed the thought by giving room to a hymn commencing with those lines :

" Look unto him, ye nations; own
Your God, ye fallen race;
Look, and be saved through faith alone.
Be justified by grace."

If any reader is disposed to criticise the poetical merits of this stanza, let him remember that there are very few false doctrines which are poetical, and that the more distinctly they are expressed the less poetical they appear.

In reference to doctrine, the Baptist hymn book is less objectionable than either of the preceding. It indulges, like them, in prayers to the Holy Spirit, in invocations of his miraculous power, and in the doubts and despondency common to all the Calvinistic parties; but it exhibits less froth and frenzy than the Methodist collection, and is far less Calvinistic than that of the Presbyterians. It contains, however, a large number of hymns which no man well instructed in the word of God would consent to sing.

The compilers of the "Christian Hymn Book" bestowed a great deal of care upon the selection of such hymns as were unobjec-

tionable in this particular, and upon the expurgation of others in their collection which had previously contained unscriptural sentiments. In this latter work they sometimes sacrificed taste to truth; but where this was the only alternative, it is certainly commendable; for no right-thinking man could wish that truth should be sacrificed to poetic taste in the devotional utterances of Christians. A few objectionable sentiments, however, escaped the vigilance of our compilers, and, stranger still, they have been permitted to pass through all the editions of the book. We recollect, at this writing, only three, which we will specify as proof of the necessity for extreme watchfulness in this particular. The first is a relic of the doctrine of final perseverance found in the popular hymn, "Broad is the road that leads to death." The Calvinistic conceit, invented for the defense of this doctrine, that if a man becomes a castaway it is proof that he never had been a Christian, is expressed in the lines:

"The fearful soul that tries and faints,
And walks the ways of God no more,
Is but esteemed *almost* a saint,
And makes his own destruction sure."

Our second specification has probably escaped general attention, as it is found in a hymn seldom sung, and possessing no particular merit, the whole of which might very well be dispensed with. The objectionable sentiment is in the first couplet:

"Happy the souls to Jesus joined,
And saved by *grace alone*."

This sounds too much like salvation by *faith alone*, and is not a whit more truthful.

The other specification is in the recruiting hymn, "O turn you! O turn you, for why will you die" The closing couplet reads thus:

"If still you are *doubting*, make trial and see,
And prove that his mercy is boundless and free."

Now this would suit very well as an invitation to the mourning bench, and for some such purpose it was originally composed; but it is most unscriptural to invite a sinner who is "*still doubting*" to come and make the confession. I have never heard it sung without feeling shocked at the incongruity, and wishing that the whole stanza were cut off from the hymn, which is otherwise a good one.

With the abatement of a very few such passages as these we may pronounce our hymn book in a most satisfactory degree pure and Scriptural in sentiment. If this were the only requisite of a perfect hymn book, we could hope for no improvement beyond what could be effected by verbal alterations in the present stereotype plates.

In the application of our second rule, which has reference to

the poetic excellence of the hymns, we must again pronounce in favor of the Christian hymn book. This decision is based, not upon the fact that it contains a greater *number* of excellent hymns than any other; but that it contains a greater number in proportion to the *whole* number. Even in the former respect, we may very confidently assume that it is superior to the Presbyterian collection, which is filled with Watts' version of the hundred and fifty Psalms, very few of which are well suited to music; and six hundred and eighty hymns, of which a vast number are devoid of poetical merit. Without an actual count it would be hazardous to make the same assertion in reference to the Methodist book with its one thousand and forty-seven hymns, or the Psalmist, with its nearly twelve hundred. But even if our book should only equal these in the actual number of good hymns, it would still stand superior to them in the ratio of over one hundred per cent., containing an equal number of good hymns in half the space.

Notwithstanding this favorable comparison, our book stands very greatly in need of improvement in this particular. Of its five hundred and sixty-eight hymns, I can count about two hundred which it could spare without any loss whatever to the people; though there are not more than this number which I would consent to lose. After these were removed, there should be added to those that remain all the hymns that can be found which would pass the test of severe criticism. This number, as we have intimated before, would not be very large, and would probably not more than supply the two hundred vacant places. Such an alteration would render our book very little capable of improvement from the poetic material of the present generation.

In reference to variety of subject-matter, we must pronounce our book inferior to that of the Baptists, and perhaps, also, to that of the Methodists. The chief difficulty encountered in the use of it is to find hymns appropriate to subjects and occasions. The supply of two hundred new ones, however, selected with a view to increased variety, would be sufficient to greatly modify, if not entirely remove, this defect.

But it is in reference to arrangement that the Christian hymn book is most defective. Its most general classification, into "Psalms," "Hymns," and "Spiritual Songs," even if founded upon a just distinction, is not made complete, for there are pieces arranged in each of these classes which belong properly to another. Its general division by subjects is also incomplete; for under the head of "Miscellany" are more than one fourth of the pieces in the book, all of which belong to some of the general subjects and should be distributed accordingly. Even the "Index

of Subjects" is defective in the omission of one of the general subjects marked in the body of the work as "Mournful Scenes." It is inexcusable that these defects should even thus long have clung to a book of so large a circulation. Each of the other three with which we have compared it contains a careful distribution of the hymns under general headings, and, in addition to the index of first lines, and that of general subjects, another index to all the particular subjects treated in individual hymns. No book can now be regarded as well arranged which does not come up to this standard.

We must also admit that in external form our book is inferior to the other three. It is generally printed on very indifferent paper, and bound in the most temporary style. There are some costly copies which are on better paper, and encased in better binding; but the plain book, such as plain farmers and business men use, should be put together in durable materials, so that it may become to him an old, as it will become a very dear companion. Besides this, we have no copies in large clear print and corresponding dimensions, neither have we a thin edition on fine paper and in flexible covers, to carry about in the pocket. All these varieties are demanded to suit the tastes and the wants of the people.

To sum up in a few words what we have now said of both the merits and the defects of the Christian hymn book, we affirm that its sentiments are, almost without exception, pure and Scriptural, and that the style of its poetry is in general of a very high order; but it is defective in variety of matter, in arrangement, and in variety of external form. In the first two of these particulars, which are by far the most important, it is far superior to any other hymn book; but in the other three it is excelled by several others. Striking a balance, however, between its comparative merits and defects, it is far superior to any other extant, though in every element of a model hymn book it stands in need of improvement.

We now reach the practical question, what shall be done to remedy these defects? Shall we have a revision and improvement of our old book, or shall we undertake an entirely new one? I think I speak the voice of nine tenths of the brotherhood, in pronouncing most emphatically for the former. When we have a good servant with some defects, we prefer to correct them, if practicable, rather than dismiss him and employ a stranger. We prize our old book too highly, and we feel too well justified in so doing, to be willing that it be entirely thrown aside. Moreover, whoever may be intrusted with the work, we would feel more confident of their success in perfecting the old book, than in the compilation of a new one. Let all the changes be made

that are necessary, but let us have the satisfaction to know that our old familiar companion is the basis on which all the changes are wrought.

What particular steps should be taken to inaugurate a revision of the hymn book we do not feel at liberty to suggest; especially as the book is the private property of Brother Campbell. We only aim to give publicity to the demands of public opinion in the matter, and to suggest an outline of the work that should be done. We trust that the public will be gratified by some speedy action in the premises.

Much needs to be said in this connection, of Sunday School hymn books, and of collections of music both for Sunday Schools and for congregational use; but to do justice to these topics would too greatly prolong this article. We may discuss them in a future number of the *Quarterly*. It is to be hoped that a progressive people like ourselves, spreading with a rapidity unexampled in modern times, and springing forward in almost every element of power as rapidly as in numbers, will not long remain behind the very foremost parties of the day in all the economics of Christ's earthly kingdom.

KAPPA.

RECIPROCAL COURTESY.—We are now exchanging with about one dozen papers and periodicals published by brethren. Most of these have done us the kindness to notice the *Quarterly*—some with a brevity and reserve we did not merit. Of the few political papers with which we exchange, all, we believe, without exception, have spoken in high and most complimentary terms of our enterprise. But of the religious papers received, only two have spoken at length, magnanimously and with real heart. These are the *AMERICAN CHRISTIAN REVIEW*, of Cincinnati, and *GOSPEL ECHO*, of Carrollton, Illinois. For the *Quarterly* these papers spoke at once and spoke their best word—they spoke it with volume and in earnest. There was nothing feeble or shy in the bold manful note they uttered. We thank these papers with a whole heart for their lengthy, frank, and cordial notices. The paper which is willing to see other worthy companions live, itself seldom deserves to die. All success to you, Brother Franklin and Brother Craig. Let our banner be the Bible, our trust be in God, our cement, brotherly love, then on let us work together.

INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC IN CHURCHES AND DANCING.

IN settling any question, whether theoretic or practical, the first thing to be agreed upon is the standard of final appeal. Without this our discussions are mere endless wranglings, and our arguments little else than mere circular talk. Neither error in thought nor error in practice is corrected. Strife is engendered and issue joined, but neither that nor this ever finds an end. Positions are taken which are untenable, and replies are made which are illogical and gratuitous; while parties are formed seemingly without the hope of remedy; and all this for the want of some standard to which appeal can be at once and decisively made. Now that we as a people have agreed to accept the New Testament as that standard is a fact too notorious to admit of question. To this we have consented to bring the smallest point of doctrine, and the most trivial feature in practice. And furthermore, we have solemnly covenanted that whatever cannot be clearly shown to have the *sanction* of this standard shall be held as not doctrine, and shall not be practiced. We say shown to have the *sanction*; for it is not enough to warrant a practice that this standard does not sanction it. No practice can be defended on this ground. To warrant the holding of a doctrine or practice it must be shown that it has the affirmative or positive sanction of this standard, and not merely that it is not condemned by it. Either it must be actually asserted or necessarily implied, or it must be positively backed by some divinely approved precedent, otherwise it is not even an item in Christianity, and is therefore, when it is attempted to be made a part of it, criminal and wrong. Right in itself, and when standing apart from Christianity it may be, but when the effort is made to constitute it either a part of the Christian doctrine or of the Christian worship then both the act to do so and the thing itself become marked with the deepest stains of sin. In itself and as a mere act we think it perfectly innocent to sprinkle water on the face of an infant; but when the attempt is made to foist it into and incorporate it with Christianity, then the frown and anathema of Heaven lie on it. To all of which we as members of the body of Christ have bound ourselves in solemn acts and covenants. The simple fact that we claim to hold a place in the family of God is proof of this. As a people we have from the first and continually to the present proclaimed that the New Testament and that alone is our only full and perfect rule of faith and practice. We have

declared a thousand times and more that whatever it does not teach we must not hold, and whatever it does not sanction we must not practice. He who ignores or repudiates these principles, whether he be preacher or layman, has by the act become an apostate from our ranks; and the sooner he lifts his hand high, avows the fact, and goes out from amongst us the better, yes, verily, the better for us.

I. Now in the light of the foregoing principles what defense can be urged for the introduction into some of our congregations of *instrumental music*? The answer which thunders into my ear from every page of the New Testament is, none. Did Christ ever appoint it? did the apostles ever sanction it? or did any one of the primitive churches ever use it? Never. In what light then must we view him who attempts to introduce it into the churches of Christ of the present day? I answer, as an insulter of the authority of Christ, and as a defiant and impious innovator on the simplicity and purity of the ancient worship. In no other light can we view him, in no other light should he be viewed. But we are told that there is no harm in instrumental music, and that therefore it may be innocently introduced into the churches of Christ, I shall certainly attempt no grave reply to this shallow thing; for argument I will not call it. Grant, then, for a moment that there is no harm in instrumental music. The question arises what kind of instrument shall be used? An *organ*, shouts the sickly puling of Rome. An organ indeed! and shall we have only an organ? Is there no good music in anything else than an organ? We know there is. Why then have only an organ? This is arbitrary and tyrannical. But what signify arbitrariness and tyranny in a church which has consented to be disgraced by an organ? Simply nothing. These are now its spirit and its law, and of course are no offense to it. But despite of even these, for now we care nothing for strife, nothing for the feelings of brethren, we shall insist on the right both for self and others to introduce each for himself the instrument with which he can best conduct his worship. For the son of Mars, then, we claim the right to introduce the fife and the drum; and for self the right to introduce, for I could never make music on anything else, but am capital on these, the Jews-harp, the tinpan, and the barrel-head. I even go farther, and with all the pluck of a Lacedemonian contend for the right of the Caledonian to have his bagpipes, and the ancient Israelite his ram's horns. To all of which let us still add a few fiddles, a tamborine, and a gong. *Vive la* music made on instruments! This is about as like pandemonium as anything we can well imagine, and about as near that place as we can well get unless we could get between

that place and the church that has adopted instrumental music, and we think there is left little room between the two on which to stand. Soberly and candidly we are pained at these symptoms of degeneracy in a few of our churches. The day on which a church sets up an organ in its house, is the day on which it reaches the first station on the road to apostasy. From this it will soon proceed to other innovations; and the work of innovating once fairly commenced, no stop can be put to it till ruin ensues. And then the spirit which precedes and fosters these innovations is a most dangerous spirit—dangerous because cruel, intractable, and unreasonable. It is cruel because it is ready to immolate everything that in the least stands in the way of its wicked work; intractable, because it will not yield on even one tittle of its innovations; and unreasonable, because it will heed neither the voice of God nor that of man. Indeed, when a church has once introduced an organ, we believe it to be true, as a general rule, of those members who take the lead in the work, that they will suffer its Bible to be torn into shreds before they will part from their pet. No matter how unanimous or how kind the voice of remonstrance may be, the spirit of innovation never retraces its steps. When once it sets in to accomplish a certain object, accomplish that object it will, though ruin marks every step in its advance. Church history teems with proofs of what is here said. Let now, as further evidence of this, any set of brethren, no matter how pious and true, set about inducing a church which has introduced an organ, to put it away, and these brethren will soon fall under its proscriptions and it will absolutely go the length of putting them away before it will put away its organ. It will part from everything and anything rather than its infamous box.

But what shall be done with such churches? Of course nothing. If they see fit to mortify the feelings of their brethren, to forsake the example of the primitive churches, to condemn the authority of Christ by resorting to will worship, to excite dissension, and give rise to general scandal, they must do it. As a body we can do nothing. Still we have three partial remedies left us to which we should at once resort. 1. Let every preacher in our ranks resolve at once that he will never, under any circumstances or on any account, enter a meeting house belonging to our brethren in which an organ stands. We beg and entreat our preaching brethren to adopt this as an unalterable rule of conduct. This and like evils must be checked, and the very speediest way to effect it is the one here suggested. 2. Let no brother who takes a letter from one church ever unite with another using an organ. Rather let him live out of a church than go into such a den.

3. Let those brethren who oppose the introduction of an organ first remonstrate in gentle, kind, but decided terms. If their remonstrance is unheeded, and the organ is brought in, then let them at once, and without even the formality of asking for a letter, abandon the church so acting; and let all such members unite elsewhere. Thus these organ-grinding churches will in the lapse of time be broken down, or wholly apostatize, and the sooner they are in fragments the better for the cause of Christ. I have no sympathy with them, no fellowship for them, and so help me God never intend knowingly to put my foot into one of them. As a people we claim to be engaged in an effort to return to the purity, simplicity, freedom from ostentation and pride, of the ancient apostolic churches. Let us, then, neither wink at any thing standing in the way, nor compromise aught essential to this end. The moment we do so our unity is at an end, and our hopes are in the dust.

II. Next in regard to Christians dancing. We frankly confess we feel ashamed and scandalized at the prevalence, in many sections of the country, of this licentious practice amongst the children of our brethren. And what hurts us little less is the fact that some even of the older brethren and sisters are giving it their countenance. Nay, they go so far as to encourage and justify it on the score that there is no harm in it; and in some cases actually send their children to dancing schools. For the sake of all such let us grant their universal plea of no harm in it, and see what it results in. There is, then, no harm in dancing; and of course no harm in any Christian's dancing. Now suppose that those who urge this plea should, on going into that intoxicating and bewildering place called the ball-room, see Bro. Campbell, Bro. John Smith, Bro. John Rogers, with other like aged and venerable men in Christ, actually engaged in a waltz, hugging other men's wives round over the floor. Could any other than a feeling of profound disgust seize them? But why? There is no harm in dancing! Yet we should feel not merely shocked at the incongruity of such a sight, but positively amazed. But how is this? These are, of all men, the ones whom dancing is least likely to corrupt; yet our feelings utterly refuse to be reconciled to their act. Surely this plea of no harm in it cannot be sound. But further, suppose that on some Lord's day, just after weeping over and partaking of the emblems of the Saviour's body and blood, a member of some church should arise and propose to clear away the seats, and that the whole church should engage in a dance; and suppose that this should actually be done. Nay further, let us suppose it to be repeated from Lord's day to Lord's day throughout the year. Would those who cry no harm in it be

willing to belong to such a church, or would they even be willing for their dancing children to be reared up in it? Hardly, we think. But why? If there be no harm in dancing, then is there no harm in dancing on the Lord's day, none in dancing in the Lord's house. The truth is, this plea is simply a specious lie with which Satan is at this time drugging these members. Let those who urge it first show that there is no harm in dancing before they ask us to acquiesce. Let them either show where it has the sanction of Christ or the apostles, or was practiced in some primitive church; or else let them forever cease to urge this plea, and abandon the practice. If they will not do this, then let them go out of the church of God into the world where they properly belong. The church never parts from aught but trouble when it parts from such members. If they can be reclaimed and saved by all just means let this be done; but the church should make no compromise, not for one day, with dancing. Let its action be kind but firm, and terribly prompt. This alone will save. Of all the unsanctioned acts a church has to deal with, none demands prompter treatment than dancing. It is one of those specious and insidious evils which must be cured in its very inception, or it is never cured. Tolerate it, and by and by those who advocate it will claim the right by prescription to engage in it. Remonstrance is vain then. Our churches should lift a unanimous voice against it, and proceed to rid themselves of it with an energy and a promptitude which would leave not a vestige of it in Zion. Let the world know, but especially let professors know, that it must be completely and forever abandoned. A stand like this once taken and maintained with dignity and firmness, and the evil is soon cured. But as long as the shilly-shallying course of some of our churches is persisted in, dancing will increase in them until it ultimately becomes the rule; then the result is clear. Attempt to correct it now, and dancing will exclude the church, and not the church dancing.

But just here, and before we close this short piece, a favorite position of the dancer and organ advocate needs to be noticed and disposed of. Each claims that since the New Testament does not in express words condemn his hobby, he therefore has the same right to have it that others have to exclude it; and that he is under no more obligation to yield his preference than is the opponent to yield his opposition. But this position is not sound. A man has a right to hold as a matter of conscience every doctrine the New Testament clearly teaches, and to practice as a matter of conscience every act it clearly sanctions; and beyond this a *Christian* conscience is a myth. Nay, further: I am bound in conscience to be opposed to everything not thus indorsed.

Now when the dancer claims the right to introduce dancing, he claims the right to innovate in a matter in which I am bound to have conscience and he is bound to have none, I cannot therefore yield to him, but he must yield to me. He must consequently abandon dancing if I object to it. For suppose me bound to yield to him in a case in which I am to have conscience and he is to have none. This of course would confer on me the right to require him to yield to me in a precisely similar case. How then would stand the matter? Simply thus, that I must yield to him both when I have and when I have not conscience, and that he must do the same with me. But this is folly and nonsense. Hence when I object, the dancer can introduce dancing on no ground save that of a criminal and wicked disregard of my conscience and my feelings, and he who does this is unworthy of a place in the church of the living God, and we say put him away. In many instances the remedy is painful we know; but, we repeat, the evil must be checked.

No greater curse can befall the church of Christ than to popularize it by tolerating within it this and like dangerous practices. By so doing I grant we may increase its members of a certain kind, but its piety and purity we should reduce to a low, very low grade. The church gains nothing by strewing the path that leads into it with flowers, and providing downy beds for those who dwell within it. Self-denial, labor, and a perpetual mortification of the flesh, are its glory and the pledge of its success. Let men know that the condition on which they can enter the church is that they part from all that pampers carnality and promotes pride, and you immeasurably increase its attractiveness. When sin gives exquisite pain and the soul sighs for the rest and the life which are in Christ Jesus, dancing and an organ are detested and shunned. The heart that delights in them and advocates them has never communed long with itself over its corruptions and deep wants. Christianity is designed to make men new creatures. The old life with its revelries, its fun, its high bursts of fleshly glee, its show and worldly usages, is exchanged for one in which pleasure is drawn from conformity to the will of him who wept and sorrowed, but never danced nor fawned on an organ, and from cultivating the most affectionate and tender regard for the feelings of such of God's children as weep over even the most trivial innovation, and from mingling in scenes which fill us with grief, steep us in sympathy, and start within us the holiest resolutions our natures can give birth to. This is the school in which Christians should aim to fit themselves for heaven, and not the ball-room. I never knew a dancing Christian on his dying bed to send for a dancer to comfort him, nor a fiddle called

for in the chamber where death completes his work. Let no Christian think that he can scandalize the church of God with the evils of which we are speaking and stand approved in the judgment day. He sports with criminal carelessness with his future destiny who so thinks. God will not suffer himself to be mocked with impunity by the impious daring of him who insults his children on earth and wounds their best feelings by dragging these innovations into the church. Here such a party may escape. The want of strictness in churches, and the shuffling indifference of overseers, may give him little pain; but the day of reckoning hastens on. The churches of Christ in the whole land owe it to themselves, and to the high and just ground they have taken, to guard with sleepless vigilance against even the semblance of an innovation on the practice and usages of the apostolic churches. Apostasies begin with things that "have no harm in them," and end in ruin. At first they creep, but in the end stride continents at a single step. Finally we say watch, beware!

A. CAMPBELL'S MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

Such we understand is the partially new title under which the Harbinger for February visits its readers, and if so we must pronounce it in fine taste. We regret that we cannot speak confidently on the point, as we have not received a number of the work this year. We further learn that Brother Campbell retires from the position of its responsible editor; and that this duty will be assumed henceforth by brethren W. K. Pendleton and C. L. Loos. For this change we have been prepared for some time past; and yet now that it comes it fills us with melancholy.

On the 4th of July next forty-one years will have passed since the day on which the preface to the *CHRISTIAN BAPTIST* bears date. For forty years and more, then, Brother Campbell has been an editor. During that time, consequently, he has issued forty serial volumes; nor are these all. The *CHRISTIAN SYSTEM* and *BAPTISM WITH ITS ANTECEDENTS AND CONSEQUENTS* are the products of his pen, with still some smaller works. Besides, he has held written discussions with the polite Maccalla, the cold, blind Owen, the specious, cunning Purcell, and the tricky, unprincipled Rice. To which is still to be added that he has traveled and preached in almost every State in the Union, in Great Britain and in Canada; besides conducting a voluminous correspondence, and being much of the time President of Bethany College. After all this, who shall murmur if this grand toiler retire for a brief season to rest and prepare ere he takes his leave for the mansion the Master has in waiting for him? With hair white for eternity and a heart chastened for the Presence on high, with not a stain on his fair name, and his work done, he now turns into his own Bethany house to await his going hence. How many a devout saint will call him blessed as he treads alone his sheltered walks till "the ship's awa" that takes him. With profound emotion we speak thus; for the patriarch of Bethany has been to us a friend and brother true. Smile on him, kind heaven, till he rests in thee!

As already said, brethren Pendleton and Loos will adorn the pages of the Harbinger for the future. They intend to enlarge the work to sixty pages a number, to purchase new type, print it on fine paper, and thus endeavor to render it worthy of its by-gone palmy days. The highest distinction we can wish them is that their success may be complete. We ask of the noblest brotherhood on earth the same patronage for the work which has sustained it hitherto; and devoutly pray that its power for good may never suffer diminution in the graceful hands which control it now. Let the brethren who have delighted so much in the work in years past again send forward their names and money over the same familiar roads along which they have passed so many a time. To my old professor and old classmate, each and jointly, herewith send my greeting, and warm best wish.

LARD'S QUARTERLY.

VOL. I.

JUNE, 1864.

No. 4.

THE GIFT OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

"Repent and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit."

UNDER every stage of development of the Remedial System man has had the assurance of the presence of God. Not, indeed, such a presence as he enjoyed in Eden; for that was direct and personal. During the earlier periods of his history, man was assured of the presence of God in sacrifice. Under the fuller development of the Remedial System, as evinced in the Jewish Institution, there were more visible, sensible, and demonstrative evidences of his presence, than were seen during the Patriarchal age. Under that Institution God came nearer to man; for he then talked with Moses face to face, and through him gave the Jewish people their Institution. Still the relation that man enjoyed under these developments of the Remedial System did not reach, in nearness and fullness, the relation of his natural and primitive state. This resulted from the simple fact that the system of redemption which God had instituted was but partially developed. When this system reaches its stage of perfect development, then the primitive and perfect relation of man to God will be attained, and *vice versa*. The essential feature of a perfectly developed Remedial System consists of one prominent item, viz: the remission of sins. For, sin being the cause of the rupture of his original relation, when this is removed, the primitive relation is restored. That stage of development, therefore, under which remission of sins takes place, must be the perfect and full development of the whole system. Christianity being the perfect and full development of the Remedial System, under which a full and perfect remission of sins takes place, it follows conclusively that Christianity restores to man his natural and primitive relation in Eden, where he enjoyed the personal presence and direct communion of God.

The gospel scheme virtually began when Christ began to preach in Judea; for, from that time salvation was preached in his name. The Jewish system virtually (though not legally and actually)

ended with the mission of John the Immerser. And while Christ was on earth, those who received him, enjoyed through him the personal presence and communion of God. When he ascended to heaven, he provided that his disciples should not be left in the world as orphans, with no divine power to protect them, and no divine presence to comfort them. Their Eden relation was restored so far as it regarded the remission of sins, but not as it regarded death. In heaven the last barrier is destroyed, and man is then, as regards both body and spirit, in union and communion again with God, such as he enjoyed in Eden. As regards man's spiritual relation with God, Eden is restored by the church; but as regards both his spiritual and bodily relations, the fullness and perfection of Eden are realized only in heaven. To meet the wants and necessities of his spiritual relation, fully restored by Jesus Christ, the Lord promised his disciples when he left them, that he would send them another comforter, who should be to them what he himself had been.

On the last evening that our Lord passed with his disciples before he suffered, he spoke plainly to them of his departure. When he told them that he must leave them, a deep sadness and gloomy forebodings as to the future, settled down on their hearts, like night on a city smouldering in its ruins. Every hope was crushed, and every expectation blasted. Life now was aimless. There was nothing on which the heart could rest a hope—nothing for which it could any longer cherish any desire to live. The past was lost—its labors were to yield no fruit. The future was a repulsive blank. Was there ever desolation like this? Was ever the gaze of a bewildered mind so vacant? But that voice which shall one day ring through the graves of the sleeping dead, and call them to life again, said, "Let not your hearts be troubled: you believe in God, believe also in me;" and the heavy load was lifted from their hearts. This is the triumph and power of faith, "Let not your hearts be troubled—I will not leave you orphans—I will pray the Father, and he will send you another comforter, and he shall abide with you forever." On the day of Pentecost, when Jesus received the Spirit, this promise was fulfilled. The Comforter, the Advocate, the Holy Spirit, came to the disciples on that day, and will continue with them until the end of time. He is to the disciples in Christ's stead. Through him is the presence and communion of God with the disciples preserved and continued.

When Christ promised his disciples the Holy Spirit as their *Paraklete*, two things were contemplated, which the Spirit should do. 1. He should lead them into all truth, and through them, convince the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment. This

work of the Spirit was confined to the apostles and such other persons as he inspired, and thus qualified for some special work. 2. He should abide with them forever. This promise embraces all disciples in all ages of the world since the Spirit came to the earth.

On the day of Pentecost, Peter explained the miraculous events of that day as the fulfillment of the promise of Christ, and also as the fulfillment of the promise of God by the Prophet Joel. These promises had special reference to the Spirit's work of inspiration. There was no other work contemplated in the promise made by Joel. It had sole reference to the work of inspiration, as is evident from the language of the prophecy. We must look, therefore, for the promise of the *gift* of the Spirit, which Peter makes in his discourse on that day, to the promise made by our Lord with regard to the Spirit. This promise contemplated the gift of the Holy Spirit as a person and in person. It was not a gift which the Spirit should bestow, or any work which he should do, such as influencing the mind and heart to the love and desire of holy things; but a gift of the Divine Person known as the Holy Spirit. The gift of inspiration must not be confounded with the gift of the Spirit; for inspiration is but an accident of his presence for a special and temporary purpose, and not a necessary consequence of his presence. The language of the promise is plain. "*And when he is come, he will convince the world of sin,*" &c. He, therefore, *first comes, and when he has come, gives extraordinary gifts to a chosen few for a special work and purpose.* These gifts were contemplated in the promise; but the real and essential promise was the Spirit himself. This is what was before the mind of Christ in making the promise that he would not leave them orphans. "I will pray the Father, and he will give *another comforter, that he may abide with you forever.*" The Holy Spirit himself is what is promised, and not this gift, nor that, nor this influence, nor that. The gifts and influences are his work after he comes; the first to be determined by the necessities of Christ's cause, and the last by the wants of man. The first we find under his general work of inspiration; the last under his work of enlightenment, and *accomplished through the words spoken or written by the inspired.* The work of inspiration will cease when the Holy Spirit has fully made known the mind and will of God to the world—when he has declared the whole counsel of God. All the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit must cease with their necessity, and the necessity for them ceases when the object for which they were given is attained.

If it were the *gifts* of the Spirit that were promised by Christ, and not the Holy Spirit himself, then it must follow that no one

has ever enjoyed the promise made by Peter, who has not been, or is not inspired. And since the gifts of inspiration have long since disappeared from the church, what becomes of the promise of Christ that the Spirit should abide with his disciples forever? and of the promise of the inspired Peter, that the obedient believer in Jesus Christ should "receive the gift of the Holy Spirit?" Moreover, if the influences of the Holy Spirit on the heart and mind, through the inspired word, exhausts the promise of Christ, then, there is really no personal relation existing between the Spirit and the disciples of Christ, as is clearly implied in the language of the promise: "and he will give you *another comforter*."

And further, if what the Spirit *does*, and not the Spirit himself, is all that is contemplated in the promise, how can the promise be made sure to those who believe on Christ through the words of the apostles? This blessing of the gift of the Spirit is incorporated in the organic law announced by Peter, and is to be made sure to every man in every age, who shall receive the Lord Jesus; and if it has reference only to what he does, by inspiration, for instance, this can be enjoyed without any personal relation existing with the Spirit, and what then becomes of the gift of the Holy Spirit on obedience? If the *work* of the Spirit was all that was contemplated as the gift of the Spirit, then there is no personal relation existing between the obedient believer and the Holy Spirit. But if the gift is the Spirit in person, then we enjoy both his presence and his work.

There can be no doubt that the gift of the Holy Spirit in person *exhausts* the promises of Christ and of Peter, that to every obedient believer the Holy Spirit becomes *personally related*; that the promise designed that the Holy Spirit in person should continue to abide forever with the church; and that when he came he should take charge of the interests of Christ's cause, convert the world, instruct the disciples, and *keep them from evil*. The work of conversion and instruction he accomplishes through men; at the first by inspired men, and since by men spreading the truth uttered by them; and the preservation of the disciples from evil, he effects by his providences, as God has always done since man's ejection from Eden. *His* work in conversion and instruction closed when he ceased to inspire men to make known the will of God. When he ceased to inspire men, the canon of Scripture was closed the whole mind of God concerning man's condition and salvation was declared; and that which inspired men have left on record, is all the means that men have now of knowing the will of God—the only means of conversion and instruction in righteousness. If men are not now converted to

God, and instructed in all things that pertain to life and godliness by the inspired word of God—by the word of truth—then there are no means for man's conversion and instruction. *The means by which men are enlightened, and their hearts influenced to turn to God, is the word of truth which inspired men have spoken and written, and this word alone.* All the moral changes effected in man's character—all the generous impulses which he may feel urging him to works of piety and humanity—all the aspirations his soul may cherish for things heavenly and divine—all the ardent and holy zeal he may feel in the cause of Christ, everything pertaining to the Christian character, all the fruits of the Spirit, have for their immediate cause the word of truth. All these are effected by the inspired truth, and by this alone. It is the only power God has ordained for the moral renovation of man. It is in this, and only this, that we have the mind and will of God expressed, and consequently it is only through this expression that his mind and will can be known. This is true, whether he speaks in reference to his conversion or his "instruction in righteousness." It is only through this word that his infinite love and mercy are known, those mighty powers which turn the soul away from sin, and bring it back to God; only here that we can know that this love and mercy speak to us in

"The bleeding hands and head and feet"

of the Lord Jesus Christ.

It must be remembered that the promise of the gift of the Holy Spirit is made to those already converted—to the disciples of the Lord Jesus Christ. The gift can have no reference, therefore, to their conversion, but may have to their instruction in righteousness. "He shall guide you into all truth." This special promise applies alone to the apostles. This he did by inspiration. In a general sense he guides all of his people into the truth. But this is not done by inspiration, as in the case of the apostles, but by the word the inspired men have spoken or written. If the Christian cannot learn the mind of God as regards his duties and obligations as a Christian from the inspired word, then the Holy Spirit in person must communicate it to him, or he cannot know it at all. He must, then, of necessity, derive all his knowledge of "all things that pertain to life and godliness" from the written word, or the Spirit himself must communicate it to him. In which of these ways, then, does he acquire this knowledge?

The fact that the Spirit inspires men to utter the will of God, proves that this is the method of making known the mind of God. But we are not left to inferential proof: we have the plainest declarations of Scripture for affirming that this is the method by which the mind of God is made known. The Apostle Paul, in

his letter to the Ephesians, says: "For this cause, I Paul, the prisoner of Jesus Christ for you Gentiles, *if you have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God, which is given me for you, how that by revelation he made known to me the mystery, as I wrote before in a few words, whereby, when you read, you may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ, which in other ages was not made known to the sons of men, as it is now revealed to his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit.*" And as to the power of this word thus spoken or written to accomplish for man all that God desires, the same apostle leaves us no room to doubt: he declares, as an inspired man that "*all Scripture given by inspiration of God is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, and for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished for all good work.*" The power of the written word—the mind of God expressed in human language—to instruct the mind and comfort the heart, was not so lightly esteemed by Christ and his apostles as by modern theologians. Hear them: "The words that I speak to you, they are spirit and they are life:" "If you keep my commandments, you shall abide in my love:" "These I have spoken that your joy may be full:" "If you abide in me, and my words abide in you, you may ask what you will, and it shall be done to you:" "For, whatsoever things were written aforetime, were written for our learning, that we, through the patience and comfort of the Scriptures, might have hope."

From these Scriptures, and others too numerous to be reproduced here, and indeed from the whole tenor of the divine volume, there is no reason to doubt that the Holy Spirit instructs the disciples in righteousness, comforts them in hope, and makes them patient under tribulation by the knowledge he has communicated, and the consolation he has given in the words which he inspired the apostles to speak and write. In that word he has expressed all that God had to communicate to men; presented all the motives which infinite wisdom could suggest capable of properly and effectually influencing the heart; and has fully exposed to view every terror and threatening that can spur the conscience onward to a life of righteousness, piety, and holiness. In that word, heaven stands exhausted of every power, influence, motive, and consideration by which men may be won away from sin, and brought back, through Christ, to the full enjoyment of the favor and communion of God.

In view of what has been said, the question may be asked, for what, then, is the Holy Spirit to abide forever with the disciples? What more is there for him to do, that can detain him on earth? If the conversion of sinners, and the instruction in righteousness of the saints, are accomplished through the inspired word, what need

was there for him to remain on earth after the whole counsel of God was declared? For what is he given to the church? For what is man brought into relation with the Holy Spirit? What more has he to do than he did by the apostles?

An answer to these questions will be found in the important and necessary work which the condition of man in this world requires of God. There are some things to be done for man which cannot be effected through the agency of the inspired word, and hence other instrumentalities must be used. The enlightenment of the mind and cultivation of the heart are not the objects to be accomplished by these other instrumentalities. These other objects belong to a different class, which are realized by different means—by means that are homogeneous with the objects. All the wants and needs of man, which are not met by the inspired word, are met by other means, and these means are homogeneous with the objects to be realized. They are as thoroughly adapted to the accomplishment of their special objects, as the inspired word is to conversion and instruction in righteousness. As the objects to be realized are distinct, so are the agencies; and as the objects do not conflict, neither do the agencies. The objects are so distinct and dissimilar, that the means by which the one class is realized, will utterly fail if applied to the accomplishment of the other. The Holy Spirit did not cure the physically afflicted by preaching “Christ and him crucified;” but he saved the soul from sin by this means; nor did he enlighten the mind, and awaken the conscience, and cultivate the heart by the exertion of his physical power. The inspired word influences the mind and will; another power must be exercised to work a miracle.

The Holy Spirit is the Executor of Christ’s will on earth. He is now the person of the Godhead, through whom God accomplishes his will among men, and especially his will in regard to the church. While Christ was on earth he kept, he says, his disciples; and as he was about to leave them, he prayed to the Father for them, that he would henceforth keep them. And as the Holy Spirit came to the disciples in Christ’s stead—another comforter—the Father answers the prayer of his Son by charging the Holy Spirit with this important duty. In this we have the providential work of the Spirit. For this reason it is important and necessary that he shall continue forever with the church.

The providential work of the Spirit, however, embraces the care of all the interests of Christ’s cause on earth. Wherever these interests call him, there is the Spirit found, laboring for Christ. He works not for himself—he speaks not for himself; all he does is for the honor and glory of Christ. Sometimes he labors

for the conversion of men, sometimes for their instruction, and sometimes for their preservation from evil, and always and everywhere, and in all ages, for the general and special welfare of the church at large, and every church and disciple in particular.

The Scriptures furnish us with a few examples of what we mean by the providential work of the Spirit; and these cases clearly define the manner in which he works to accomplish his purposes, and present the means which he uses to attain his objects. A striking and remarkable instance we have in the conversion of the Ethiopian nobleman. This man was in all probability a Jew. He had been to Jerusalem to worship; and God determined to carry the gospel into Ethiopia by him. To do this it was necessary to convert him. Hence an angel said to Philip, the Evangelist, "Arise, and go toward the south, into the way that goeth down from Jerusalem to Gaza. And he arose and went." The object of this command was that Philip might fall in with the Ethiopian nobleman as he was returning home. His road led from Jerusalem to Gaza, and Philip was sent on that road that he might intercept him as he traveled homeward. When the nobleman appeared, the Spirit said to Philip, "Go near and join yourself to the chariot." He did so, and heard him reading the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah. This was enough for Philip; he immediately opened a conversation with the nobleman, which led to Philip's preaching to him Jesus. At length, the nobleman believed, from the evidences that Philip produced, that Jesus of Nazareth, who had lately been crucified at Jerusalem by Pontius Pilate, was indeed the promised Messiah of the Jews, the person described by the prophet in the chapter he was reading, and he at once submitted to his authority.

This case is sufficient to settle the whole question of the Spirit's work in conversion. God had ordained that men, by the inspiration of the Spirit, should preach the gospel, and of this ordinance we find no infringement. This is the established agency in conversion. Men must hear before they can believe; and "how can they hear without a preacher." To send the preacher to men, or to bring men to the preacher, is the work of the Spirit's providence; and in the case of the nobleman we observe how the Spirit does this. The inspiration of Philip to preach the gospel, could not, or at least did not, tell him that a certain man would on a certain day, be traveling on a certain road, by whom the gospel could be sent into a distant country. Therefore, an angel was dispatched to Philip to tell him to go down on that road. This was all that the angel did, and it seems a small matter on which to dispatch an angel from heaven. It is well to observe that the angel did not state the object for which he should go

down that road; and we have no reason to believe that Philip asked for any. He at once obeyed the command of the angel; and as he traveled along the road, he could but wonder for what he was there. When he saw the chariot, he knew nothing of the person traveling in it; nor whether it concerned him to know. It was necessary, therefore, that he should be told to speak to the traveler; hence the Spirit said to him, "Join yourself to the chariot." Here the work of the Spirit ceased; Philip was competent for the rest. Of what the Spirit had done to bring the preacher to him, the nobleman knew nothing; nor could we see any agency of the Spirit, if the inspired historian had not so informed us. It is not unreasonable to suppose that there have been many cases similar to this in every age of the church; but as we have no historian who is guided by the Holy Spirit to relate what the Spirit did in any particular case, we can never assuredly know in what cases of conversion he takes a similar part, or how he weaves the wonderful net-work of events to effect his work in providence.

There is no truth more clearly and indubitably established than that God governs the world by special providences, independently of his government by laws. He has established fixed and unalterable laws over the physical and moral worlds, which accomplish all the purposes for which they were ordained. With these laws he never interferes. A miracle is no interference with fixed and established law; it is *above* natural law. If he submerge a district of country for the purpose of destroying its inhabitants, he does it in harmony with the laws which govern the physical world. If he attempt to save a part of the inhabitants of that country from the coming overthrow, the attempt is made in perfect harmony with the laws which govern the world. And if in certain cases, when his purposes cannot be effected by established laws alone, he acts in conjunction with these laws, he does not thereby interfere with them, or violate them. If objects and purposes do not lie within the range of the action of general laws, he interposes special acts which bear immediately on the object in view, in order to realize them. The truth of these remarks is corroborated by the facts in the case of the conversion of the Ethiopian nobleman.

Another instance in which we may observe the providential work of the Spirit, is the case of Apollos of Alexandria, while preaching in Ephesus. The historian says: "And a certain Jew, named Apollos, born at Alexandria, an eloquent man, and mighty in the Scriptures, came to Ephesus. This man was instructed in the way of the Lord; and being fervent in Spirit, he spake and taught diligently the things of the Lord, *knowing only the baptism*

of John. And he began to speak boldly in the synagogue: whom, when Aquila and Priscilla had heard, *they took him to them, and expounded to him the way of God more perfectly.*" This man was well versed in the Jewish Scriptures, and was "instructed in the way of the Lord," so far as that was made known by the mission of John, and the personal ministry of Jesus. He does not appear to have heard of the further developments that had taken place, and continued to preach the baptism of John, and to immerse persons into that baptism. He was not an inspired man, but being an eloquent man, he was highly esteemed by his Jewish brethren. He was a godly man, and, consequently, was earnest and diligent in teaching the things of the Lord. His case is very suggestive. There may be many such as he who may earnestly pray to God that he would enlighten their minds, that he would "open their eyes that they might behold wonderful things out of his law," and lead them into the truth. Apollos may have thus prayed, and earnestly entreated God to direct his mind in teaching the things of the Lord. And if such prayers were indeed offered by him, he found an answer to them when he came to Ephesus.

It is of interest and importance to observe how well God answered his prayer, and yet did no violence to the ordained means of instruction. Aquila and Priscilla who had been banished from Rome by the Emperor Claudius, and who were at that time in Ephesus, heard Apollos preach, and seeing that he was but imperfectly acquainted with the gospel of Christ, took him to their home, and explained to him the way of the Lord more perfectly. There is nothing strange in all this. It is a very natural case; so natural that it scarcely arrests our attention. But, when contemplated in all its bearings, it seems to teach us an important lesson in regard to the subject to which it relates. A case so natural has, no doubt, many parallels in every age. When viewed in the light of the Scriptures, they clearly appear as the providences of God, by which men are brought under the light and influences of the gospel, and which providences lead to their conversion or more perfect instruction in the things of the Lord. In this case Apollos was a preacher, and his instructors persons who had had better opportunities of learning the way of salvation.

We do not know, and cannot know, what agency the Spirit had in bringing about this interview between Apollos and Aquila and Priscilla. They had come from Rome, and he from Alexandria, and met accidentally, as we would say, in Ephesus. But the Holy Spirit may have so arranged the events in the life of each one of these persons, that a conjunction should happen at that particular

time, and in that particular place. But as the historian does not inform us, we cannot positively say that he did ; but there is just as much reason for believing that he did, as there would be for believing that he did bring about the necessary conjunction of events in the case of Philip and the Ethiopian, had the historian not mentioned particularly the agency which the Spirit had in bringing Philip and the nobleman together, that he might hear the gospel and believe.

From these examples we gather the character and scope of the work of the Spirit, which he does independently of the word he has inspired. They develop also a solid reason and necessity for the Spirit's continued presence with the church. In this way, he will always be with the preachers of his word, to instruct them in the things of the Lord. They show us also the manner in which the Spirit works to place sinners under circumstances in which they may hear the word of the gospel and believe, and how he works in the instruction of his saints, and in preserving them from evil. These latter objects men cannot accomplish. They lie entirely beyond their reach. They are objects that the Spirit cannot accomplish through inspiration. To realize these he is under the necessity of using other and different agencies, and all these we class under the general term of providences.

We are now prepared to understand and appreciate the purposes for which the Spirit was promised and given to the church, and in these purposes, the character and scope of his work. The first object was to inspire men, that *through them*, he might "convince the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment," and *through their inspiration*, give to the world "all things that pertain to life and godliness," and furnish the church with those Scriptures which would be "profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, and instruction in righteousness," that the man of God might be "thoroughly furnished for every good work." The second object was, that by his *providences* he might do all else that the interests of the cause of Christ, and the wants and interests of the sinner, as well as the saint, required, which could not be met but by agents to be ordained and used at the time these wants and interests should arise. No general provision at the beginning could be ordained, which would meet the varied and constantly recurring wants and interests of men, tossed about on the tempestuous ocean of life, and subject to all the changes and vicissitudes of a world constantly undergoing change. It was, therefore, absolutely necessary that the Holy Spirit should be ever present, that he might ordain, adopt, and use agents as the necessity for them should arise.

We have now reached the point, in the investigation of this

subject, where we may inquire, what is the full import and meaning of the *gift of the Holy Spirit*, which is promised to every immersed believer in Jesus Christ? What we have said has been said with reference to a more special consideration of the subject as developed in the Christian Scriptures. In these Scriptures, the Spirit is represented as maintaining a very close relation to the church; and it is now our purpose to unfold, if possible, the nature, character, and extent of this relation. We have now only reference to the relation which he sustains to every obedient believer. The gift is based on the fact that he is a pardoned man; for the remission of sins is an essential prerequisite. He was not promised to any other character. Christ promised the Spirit to his disciples, and positively declared that the world cannot receive him. We shall have no reference, in what we are about to say, to the Spirit's work in inspiration; but to that which is generally understood to be his work in comforting and strengthening the saints. That was the grand and precious promise of Christ: "I will not leave you comfortless"—orphans: "I will send the Holy Spirit to you." What, then, is the relation which the Spirit sustains to the church?

We have before remarked that the *gift of the Spirit* promised to Peter, was the Spirit himself. It was the Spirit in person, and as a person, who was promised by Peter; for this was the promise which the Lord made. This, then, is the character of the gift. It is a person, and he a divine person. It is not a power or influence, or anything of the kind. It is as much a gift of a person to the church, as Christ was the gift of a person to the world.

Moreover, the ordinance which brings us into relation with the Holy Spirit, brings us into relation also with the Father and the Son: for men are immersed "into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit." This is a wonderful and intimate relation. It is so intimate and close that men are said to be *in* God and *in* Christ. This language is used to express the nearness of the relation, and almost oneness of the persons. Christ speaks of God being *in* him, and him *in* God; and of his disciples being in both God and Christ. The oneness of which Christ speaks is not a oneness of *persons*, but a oneness of mind and heart and soul, in which there is undisturbed harmony between the mind and will of God, and the mind and will of men. Such a union as this exists between God and his holy and intelligent creatures in every part of his vast universe. Yet, as he is a person, and his intelligent creatures are persons, the oneness of which he speaks cannot be a oneness of persons. Such a union is wholly unknown in any department of creation. The union that exists in Christ, is the union of *natures*, and not of persons. A

union such as that of which Christ speaks as existing between himself and his disciples, is, in many instances, presented to us in human society, and especially in the marriage relation; but these present no difficulty and occasion no surprise. We are not startled or confounded at the language that pronounces husband and wife *one flesh*; and yet this is the relation that exists between Christ and his church, and which is expressed by the language under consideration. The hearts of many are wedded—and if you will, *welded*—together—cemented by love, yet they are distinct persons, and commune with each other through the medium of language—that medium established in accordance with the constitution of their nature, and rejoice in and are strengthened and comforted by each other's society. There is a union of hearts, but not of persons. All this is clear to the commonest understanding. But when we come to speak of a union existing between God and man, between the Spirit and the Christian, our ideas become confused, and we see floating in the field-view of our imagination, a phantom, without clearly defined outlines, and shrouded by mists and clouds, of which the mind can form no rational conception.

The relation which exists between God and all his holy intelligences in the universe is pre-eminently social. He communes with them, as it were, face to face, and their wills and hearts move on together as two parallel lines. This is the oneness of which Christ speaks. Such a relation is absolutely essential to the happiness of a holy, pious heart. It is, therefore, the normal relation of every spiritual creature. This was the relation man enjoyed in Eden, and the relation he lost when he sinned. Sin interrupted this relation, and will continue the interruption so long as it exists. In proportion as this barrier has been removed, in the same proportion has this relation been restored; and when the barrier is completely removed—when a plenary remission of sins takes place, the relation will be completely restored. This fact the dispensations of religion have clearly and unmistakably developed. In proportion as we find the system developed, which is designed to remove every barrier to a full and free communion between God and man, in that proportion or degree do we find him brought nearer to his natural or normal relation.

This fact being true, we would expect to find the earliest developments of the system of restoration in the elements of that system. And this is just what we do find. In sacrifice, the first and earliest ordained element of the Remedial System, we have the first avenue opened up, which leads to a full and free communion again between God and sinful, sinning man. Only here did man get a glimpse of the Infinite Father, from whose glorious presence

he had been separated by transgression, in the earliest ages of the race. Only here did he realize that God was near him, and looked upon him with any favor. The fire that descended and consumed the sacrificial victim, demonstrated the presence and approbation of God. It was only at the altar that man could know that God would receive him, and hold communion with him. In the process of time the priest became a prophet, and through him also did God hold communion with man. These continued to be the avenues through which men approached God, until the introduction of a more perfect system, and a more intimate and close relation was established by the Jewish Institution.

This institution was greatly in advance of the Patriarchal. It was not a continuation of the Patriarchal, but a new and distinct institution. It was ordained in consequence of the adoption of a certain family and people as the peculiar and chosen people of God. One of its important designs was to illustrate the name and majesty and power of God in the world, and to contrast him sharply with the gods of the nations. Through this institution he designed to unfold to the world three grand and glorious attributes of his character: justice, truthfulness, and holiness. This people were, to a great extent, to be the exponents of God's will and character to the world; and it was expressly intended that he should be known throughout the whole earth as the God of the Hebrews. As their God, he was known to preside over them, guard, defend, and protect them; to bless all who blessed them, and to curse all who cursed them; and to live and dwell among them. The law and the ceremonies which he instituted for them, brought the people into a closer relation with God than man had enjoyed since his ejection from Eden. The Mediator of the Institution was admitted to a personal audience with the God of heaven. God was seen in their Tabernacle; he came down among them in a cloud, and talked face to face with Moses, as a friend talks with a friend. The people saw in the cloud the symbol of his presence, and heard his voice issuing from the cloud when he communed with Moses. The Children of Israel recognized, through the symbol of the cloud that overhung the Tabernacle, the pillar of fire by night, and the pillar of cloud by day, the presence of God among them, and were made by these symbols of his presence to realize that he dwelt among them.

At the door of the Tabernacle he appeared to Moses, and talked with him in the presence of all the people. In the holy of holies he appeared to the high priest above the mercy seat between the Cherubim of glory, and there communed with him, and received the blood of the annual atonement. He was recognized as walking in the midst of their camps, to deliver them, and

to make their enemies give way before them. Hence, holiness to the Lord was apparent everywhere.

The sanctuary was erected that God might in it commune with the people. "And let them make me a Sanctuary that I may be seen among them." (*οφθήσομαι ἐν ὑμῖν.*) By this he walked among the Children of Israel: "I will set my Tabernacle among you (*ἐν ὑμῖν*), and I will walk among you, (*εμπεριπατήσω ἐν ὑμῖν*); and I will be your God, and you shall be my people." The Sanctuary was made holy by his presence; at its door he met and communed with the priests to receive the blood of the sacrificial victims. The people realized that he was there—they knew that God was among them. Therefore, they felt all the confidence which this conviction could inspire, that he would protect, defend, and bless them. Such a conviction and confidence as to the presence of God are necessary to the strength and consolation of one who is helpless amid dangers, and dependent for everything that he needs. Without this conviction and confidence, the heart cannot so successfully battle in the conflicts of life; it cannot struggle in hope that deliverance will come at last; it cannot feel itself stayed as upon a rock, and feel itself safe and secure against all the tempests that may beat upon it. A conviction as to the presence of God is essential to the maintenance of his allegiance, and power to overcome temptation. The truth of all this, the history of the Jewish nation fully corroborates. God had never so visibly manifested himself to men before. Moses saw him in the burning bush; in the plagues he brought on the King and people of Egypt; the Children of Israel saw him at the Red Sea; at the waters of Marah; at Mt. Sinai; in the stream that issued from the smitten rock, and that supplied them and their flocks and herds with water in the midst of a barren waste. They saw him in the judgments he sent upon them in the wilderness. Never was a people so thoroughly under the eye and power of God. All these displays of his presence and power were necessary to impress their minds with the grandeur, majesty, and holiness of his character; all these were necessary that they might know and realize that God was among them; that he was their God, and they his people. This close and intimate relation was essential to their happiness; and though they trembled when he spoke to them in the terrible judgments of his justice, truth, and holiness, yet they rejoiced in the fact that he was among them. In this we see the strange and wonderful peculiarity of man. Though created

"The Lord of the fowl and the brute;"

yet is he a helpless dependent. With all his grand and wonderful powers, he is yet a weak, fragile, and timid being. He is

conscious that he needs a superior power on which to lean. He dreads to move lest the step should prove to be false. He yearns for a guide to lead him through the dark and labyrinthian future. He realizes that he needs the presence of one who is able and willing to defend, protect, and preserve him, to whom he may appeal, without fear of repulse, in every trial. This feeling of dependence is essential to his highest happiness; because it brings him to the feet of God. Such is the constitution of his spiritual nature. By this feeling alone can he be kept close to God, the very sustenance of his life. By this alone can he preserve his allegiance to God, and enjoy his favor; because it stirs his love to its profoundest depths. His body is not more dependent on the dust of earth than is his spirit on God. How wise the constitution of his being! How admirably adapted to secure and preserve his highest happiness and enjoyment!

In the sinlessness of Eden, we see him in his natural state, happy and contented in the enjoyment of the presence and communion of God. In the world, he is a broken-hearted outcast, groping in the gloom and darkness of a world where God is no more seen and enjoyed as he was in Eden. Here and there, the light of his glorious countenance beams for a moment to cheer his heart, then all is darkness again, more dreadful because of the momentary light. In the fires of the sacrificial altar, he smiles on the broken spirit of man, and through the prophets he utters a word of cheer or warning. The Father, though now unseen, still watches over his child, and is constantly laboring to bring him home again. His dark mind he enlightens with the word of his law, and inspires his sinful heart with hope at the altar of sacrifice. He comes nearer to him, and dwells among men, and they see him in the cloud that overshadows the sanctuary; in the pillar of fire by night, and the pillar of cloud by day. The heart again rejoices in the presence of God, and God and man approach their Eden relation.

This relation could not be fully restored by the Jewish Institution, because that institution provided no atonement which could effectually remove the barrier to their union and communion; no life was found under it adequate to take away sin. Hence, the restoration of man's Eden relation was only partial under the Jewish Institution. The relation can only be fully and perfectly restored when sins are fully and effectually forgiven, and when sins are forgiven and remembered no more, man's spiritual relation in Eden will be restored.

Under Christianity the remission of sins is enjoyed. Hence, the promise of a free and full communion again with God, manifested in the gift of the Holy Spirit. The remission of sins having taken place, the Holy Spirit comes to the sanctuary and

dwells with men. This restores man's spiritual relation in Eden. He comes as a person, and holds communion with pure and holy men, as God communed with Adam in Eden. He comes to abide with redeemed men forever, for they now enjoy the relation of eternal life. As God communed with Adam in person; as he talked with Moses, and communed with Aaron, and dwelt among the Children of Israel, in person, and as a person, so does the Holy Spirit dwell and commune with the church as a person, and in person. The communion of God with Adam in Eden finds its representative—the type is antetyped—in the communion of the Holy Spirit with Christians. The church is Eden restored as far as man's spiritual relation is concerned.

The New Testament Scriptures affirm the communion of the Holy Spirit with Christians. They declare that the Spirit abides and dwells with the church—with Christians. Of this, there is not, and cannot be, the slightest doubt. The only question that is raised in regard to this subject, relates to the nature and character of the relation the Spirit sustains to the Christian. It is whether the relation and communion of the Spirit are personal, differing in no essential particular from the communion of persons in general; or whether the Spirit does not actually inhabit, in his own proper person, the body of the Christian, abiding and dwelling in him as the spirit of man dwells in his own body—whether the Holy Spirit does not influence and commune *directly* with the spirits of Christians, and independently of the medium of language? We have already seen that there is one class of men who believe that the Spirit acts immediately on the mind of man in conversion; and there is another class who believe that he operates in conversion through the word alone; but that he dwells in the hearts of Christians and communes directly, and independently of the word of truth, with the spirits of Christians, and by this *direct* communion, comforts and strengthens them. The views of the first have been shown to be erroneous: we will now endeavor to show that the other view referred to is untrue in fact, contrary to analogy, and in conflict with the teachings of the Scriptures. That the reader may not be in doubt as to the position which we affirm to be in harmony with fact, analogy, and Scripture, we will endeavor to state it in unambiguous language. We believe that the Holy Scriptures are the only means that the Holy Spirit uses to enlighten the minds of men in regard to every relation they may sustain to God, and to comfort and strengthen the heart of the Christian. And the evident reason why the Scriptures are the only means which the Spirit uses for this object, is the fact that they contain all that God has to say to man, whether he be a sinner or a saint, and that they contain all the motives, consid-

erations, hopes, and fears, which can arouse, strengthen, and comfort the heart. These are the true and legitimate powers which one spirit can use with another spirit to influence the mind and action of the spirit whom it is wished to influence, and they are the only powers which can accomplish the desired object, so long as the Spirit maintains and exerts its own inherent, self-determining will unimpaired, and unshackled. If what is here affirmed be true—and we are fully persuaded that it is—then there can be no reason why the Holy Spirit should dwell *in the heart*. We acknowledge that a failure of our reason to perceive its necessity and propriety, is not absolutely conclusive; nor to be put in opposition to the word of God—not for a moment. But when the language of Scripture is doubtful, then our reason must be called into requisition. And when our reason has come to perceive and appreciate the beauty and symmetry of such a divine system as Christianity is, it then does become a power which can be rightfully and advantageously used in determining whether or not a certain *theory* is consistent with the teachings of the divine record. And when it perceives that a certain view is not consistent with the beauty and symmetry of the divine system, it is justified in pronouncing the view false. If the Scriptures contain all the knowledge that is necessary for man's salvation and instruction in righteousness, as they certainly do; and if these are the only legitimate and natural powers which can enlighten, comfort, and strengthen the human heart under all circumstances, then there can be nothing for the Spirit to do that he should dwell *in the heart*.

But the best and most certain way to determine whether such is really what the Scriptures mean when they speak of the Spirit dwelling with Christians, is to appeal to those Scriptures themselves, from which we derive all our knowledge on this subject. Do the Scriptures, then, affirm unequivocally that the Holy Spirit *literally or personally dwells in the Christian*? We are fully persuaded that they do not; but that, on the contrary, they teach that the Holy Spirit as a person and in person *literally dwells with and among Christians, or in the church*, when the church is contemplated as a temple.

All that has been said in regard to the relation which man has sustained to God in the different states in which he has been placed, has been said with reference to the determination of this important question. We think we have shown that the relation in every instance has been *personal*; and we hence infer that the relation which the Holy Spirit sustains to Christians is of the same character. The relation, therefore, of the Spirit to men, being essentially the same as that of God with Adam in Eden,

and with the Children of Israel under the Jewish Institution; it is contrary to these analogous relations to affirm that the Spirit's relation to the Christian is not personal; or that it differs in any manner from the relation of man in Eden, and under the law.

To prove that the view now under consideration is not true in fact, it is sufficient to show that the Scriptures do not sustain it. To this we will devote the remainder of what we have to say on this subject.

In almost every instance in which the Spirit is spoken of as abiding or dwelling with the disciples, the language fully sustains the view that the dwelling is *among* the disciples, and *not in* them, and is expressive of a *relation* and *not of a possession*. If the Spirit of God dwell and abide *with* Christians, his dwelling is one of *relation*, and *not of possession*, as it would be, if he dwelt *in* man, as man's spirit dwells in his body.

The first promise of the Holy Spirit as a dweller with men was made by our Lord on the evening before he was crucified. The promise was made to cheer his disciples, troubled and dispondent on hearing that he was about to leave them. He said to them: "I will not leave you as orphans;" but "I will pray the Father, and he will give you *another comforter*, that he may abide *with* you forever (*μένη μεθ' ὑμῶν*), the Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive because *it seeth* him not, neither knoweth him; but you know him, because he dwelleth *with* you, (*παρ' ὑμῶν μένει*), and shall be *in* you," (*ἐν ὑμῖν*). In this passage there are three distinct words used to express the relation which the Spirit should sustain to the disciples. The first is *meta* with the genitive, and signifies that the persons are associated together, in the company of each other. The second is *para* with the dative, and has essentially the same signification in English. It places the persons at the side of each other, as two walk together in company. The last is *en* with the dative, which places the Spirit *among* the disciples. When used to express the relation between persons, it can have no other meaning than with or among. The first two indicate what must be the meaning of the third; and in harmony with their meaning we translate the preposition *en*, *among*. All these words, used as they are in the same sentence, and with reference to the same thought, the relation which the Spirit sustains to the disciples, seem designed to intensify the thought, and show how near and intimate should be the relation of the Spirit with the disciples. When we remember that Christ was consoling his disciples with the promise of *another Advocate*, or comforter, who should be given them by the Father in his place, we can more fully appreciate the language of our Lord, when assuring them that the Holy Spirit would come to them

and abide with them. The nature of the gift promised, and the object of the Spirit's mission, show that the view here taken of this passage of Scripture, must be correct, and particularly demonstrate the correctness of the meaning of the last preposition, (*εν*.)

On the meaning of this preposition (*εν*), the doctrine of the personal, or literal indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the Christian, is based. Small and narrow as the foundation is, it is nevertheless true, that men have built on it the doctrine which contradicts the moral constitution of man, does violence to the beauty and symmetry of the Remedial System, and nullifies the great power of God in the salvation of men; and such Scriptures as these are relied on as proof: "But you are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if indeed the Spirit of God *dwell in you*." (*οικει εν υμιν*): "But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead *dwell in you*, (*οικει εν υμιν*), he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also make alive your mortal bodies by his Spirit that *dwelleth in you*"—on account of, or because of his Spirit that dwells in you, (*διὰ τὸ ενοικῶν εν υμιν*): "And because you are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father:" "That good thing which was committed to thee keep by the Holy Spirit who dwells in us:" "know you not that your body is the temple of the Holy Spirit who is in you?" The same preposition, *εν*, is used in all these passages, and in the last two may, without doing violence to the context, be translated *among*, in accordance with its evident meaning in the promise of our Lord. In all these passages, with the exception of that from Galatians, iv: 6, and that from Corinthians, 1 Cor. vi: 19, the preposition may be translated *among*, and no violence will be done to the sense of the passage.

In relation to the passage in Galatians, in which this preposition *εν* does not occur, but where it is supposed to be clearly implied by the words, "hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son *into your hearts*," it must be observed that the Apostle is not speaking of the relation which the Spirit sustains to the church or to Christians; but of that freedom from the bondage of the law which they enjoyed through Jesus Christ. So long as they were under the law they were in bondage to the law, and the spirit of bondage was in their hearts, but now, being freed from the bondage of the law by Jesus Christ, they were freed from the spirit of bondage; and attaining their state of majority—the state of *sonship*, the spirit of a son took possession of their hearts, and they could cry, Father. Because they were minors, they were under the law as slaves; or rather, because they were under the law, they were minors, and treated as slaves (Chap. iv: 1), though heirs, indeed,

to the estate; but being freed from the law by Jesus Christ, they attain their full majority, and become sons and heirs according to law; and because they are now *sons*, the feeling and dependence of the slave no longer exist in their hearts, but the spirit and feeling of a son, and they address the parent, not as *master*, but as *father*. The spirit here spoken of, is *not the Holy Spirit*, but the conscious feeling of independence and heirship which a son feels on attaining his majority. This is evident from the contrast presented between the spirit of bondage, and the spirit of a son, in Rom. viii: 15: "For you have not received the *spirit of bondage* again to fear; but you have received the *spirit of adoption*, (sonship) in which (state) (*ἐν ᾧ*) we cry, Abba, Father." The Holy Spirit is nowhere in the Scriptures called "the spirit of his Son—the spirit of adoption." Such a use of the word spirit has always reference to the temper, mind, and disposition of Christ, and not to the divine person known as the Holy Spirit. This passage, therefore, can afford no evidence in behalf of the doctrine that the Holy Spirit *dwells personally in the Christian*.

In regard to the passage in the letter to the Corinthians, 1 Cor. vi: 19, it may be affirmed with equal confidence, that neither does this passage afford any evidence in favor of the doctrine, when it is properly considered in its connections. The Apostle in that section of his letter, is speaking of some of the immoralities which had crept into the church at Corinth, and shows how utterly inconsistent such immoralities are with the principles of the religion of Jesus Christ. He declares to them that, in becoming disciples of Jesus Christ their *bodies* had become *members of Christ*: "Know you not that your *bodies* are the *members of Christ*?" Their bodies being sacred and holy because of this union, it was a degradation of their bodies to join them in fornication to a harlot, and utterly repulsive and abhorrent to the purity and holiness of Christ, of whom their bodies were members. So pure and holy is the body by this connection with Christ, consecrated by this union, to a pure and holy life, that the Apostle declares the body to be a temple of purity and holiness—the temple of the Holy Spirit, thus made by the principles of purity and holiness which he enjoins on every Christian. When these principles, taught by the Holy Spirit in the inspired volume, take possession of the heart of man, they lead him to an entire consecration of his body, soul, and spirit to the Lord Jesus; and when his body is by these principles kept from sin; when the spirit of man no more yields its body as an instrument of unrighteousness, that body can be called, in a figure, the temple of the Holy Spirit, just as God and Christ are said to dwell in us.

That the language is figurative there can be no rational doubt.

It is of the same character as that which, in the same connection, and with reference to the same thought, speaks of the Christian's body being a *member of Christ*. This is, beyond all question, figurative. No one pretends to regard it as literal. And since the other declaration of the Apostle is of the same category as this, and grows out of it, it follows conclusively that, if we are to regard the first as figurative, we must also regard the other as figurative.

The Apostle was addressing in this letter the church in Corinth at large, and speaks in this connection of the Holy Spirit being among them. In the former part of this same letter he speaks of the *church as the temple of God*, and in harmony with this figure, speaks of the Holy Spirit dwelling in this temple. Here he recurs to the same thought, and charges them to keep their bodies pure and holy as the temple of God, because the Holy Spirit was among them. No impurity or uncleanness is to be found where God dwells. For this the camps of Israel were to be kept clean. The Lord God walked in the midst of these camps, and hence in no part of these camps was any uncleanness to be seen. All unclean persons were placed beyond the camps, and the lepers especially. So in the church of the living God, which is now his temple, no uncleanness is to be seen anywhere: but everywhere, in body, soul, and spirit, there is to be written, "holiness to the Lord." Hence even their bodies must be kept from all impurity, and no fellowship "with the unfruitful works of darkness" could for a moment be tolerated. While their bodies were the members of Christ's they should be wholly consecrated to him; being joined to Christ, they should not be joined to a harlot; for the union is such that the two are declared to be *one flesh*.

Such is the teaching of this passage; and there is, therefore, nothing in it which favors the idea that the dwelling of the Holy Spirit is in the bodies of Christians. Such a view demands that the language be taken *literally*; and since a literal dwelling is inconsistent with the whole scope of the passage, we are compelled to reject it as affording no proof in favor of the theory in question. That we are correct in this conclusion, will appear, we venture to affirm, still more evident as we proceed.

We hold it as a fundamental truth, that the Scriptures of divine truth are perfectly consistent; that there cannot be any possible conflict or contradiction in their teachings. We should never lose sight of this truth when investigating the Christian system. Without this perfect consistency in all its parts there could be no *system* in Christianity. Indeed, the Bible could not be from God; for everything from him—from infinite knowledge and wisdom—presents the most perfect system possible to an infinite mind.

The systems of the physical and organic worlds are not more perfect and complete than is the Remedial System developed in the divine record. Everything from God is perfectly systematic and consistent.

With this fundamental truth before our minds, we must ever expect to find the most perfect accord between Christ and his apostles. If, therefore, we have determined the relation which the Holy Spirit sustains to the Christian from what Christ has said of him, we must find that the apostles teach nothing different or contrary. The language in which our Lord embodied the promise of the Holy Spirit, clearly establishes the correctness of the view of the Spirit's relation to the church, and to the Christian, here insisted on; that he dwells personally or literally, *in the church as a temple*, and *among* the disciples, and *not in* them. As further proof of the correctness of this view, we now refer to what the Apostle Paul has said in the third chapter of his first letter to the Corinthians.

The Apostle, in this part of his letter, is speaking of schisms in the church, and rebukes them sharply for the contentions in the church, growing out of their love and admiration for different preachers of the gospel. One said, "I am of Paul;" another, "I am of Apollos;" and another, "I am of Cephus;" and another, "I am of Christ." He then asks, "Is *Christ* divided?" Was Paul crucified for you? or were you baptized into the name of Paul?" This party spirit was the cause of the contentions and schisms; and this spirit he sharply rebuked: "Who is Paul? and who is Apollos, but ministers through whom you believed?" "I may plant, and Apollos may water, but God gives the increase." "You are God's husbandry, you are God's building. According to the grace of God given to me, as a wise master-builder, I have laid the foundation, and another builds thereon. But let every man take heed how he builds thereon. For other foundations can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ. * * * Know you not that *you are the temple* of God, and that the Spirit of God *dwells in you* (*οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν*). If any man defile the temple of God, him will God destroy; for the temple of God is holy, which *temple you are*." Now as it is the church that is built on this foundation, the temple here spoken of is the church; and it was *this* temple in which the Spirit dwelt, and this temple which was defiled by their schisms, and which they threatened to destroy by these contentions: "For while one says, 'I am of Paul,' and another, 'I am of Apollos,' are you not carnal?" The letter is addressed to the church as a body; and the "*you*" who are the "husbandry," "the building," and "the temple," is the church. Hence as a husbandry it was planted and watered and cultivated

by God; as a building it was built on Christ as the foundation; and as a temple, it was inhabited by God through his Spirit.

The same Apostle, in his letter to the church at Ephesus, has the same thought before his mind, and uses very similar language: "Now, therefore, you are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints and the household of God, and are built upon the foundation of apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone, in whom all the *building* fitly framed together, groweth into a *holy temple* of the Lord; in whom also you are builded together for a habitation of God through the Spirit." When we remember what it is that is built on this foundation, as declared by the Lord himself; and when we call to mind the language of this Apostle in his letter to the church at Corinth, already examined, we cannot be in doubt as to the meaning of this passage. The language is too pointed and unequivocal to allow any room for doubt, that the building he here refers to, and which God inhabits by his Spirit, is the *church*. Peter also speaks of Christians as "living stones, built up a Spiritual house." From all these passages, the conclusion is not to be resisted, that the church of Christ is the building, the temple, which is inhabited by God, and in which he dwells by the Spirit. This is the place of his dwelling. In *this* temple he dwells as he dwelt in the Tabernacle and in the Jewish temple; and he dwells and walks *among* Christians and with Christians, as he dwelt and walked *among* the Children of Israel: "You are the temple of the living God, as God hath said, I will dwell and walk among them (*ἐν αὐτοῖς*), and I will be their God and they shall be my people." In the passage in Leviticus, from which this quotation is likely made, the Greek preposition *ἐν* is translated *among*, and it ought to be so translated in Corinthians. When the church is considered under the figure of a temple, the simile requires that the preposition shall be translated *in*; but when the church is considered as a great body of Christians scattered throughout the world—a great people united together by common bonds, then it ought to be translated *among*; since God may be said to dwell *in a temple*, but is never said to *walk* in it; and may be said to *walk among a people*, but is never said to *dwell in them*.

It is necessary to refer to other passages of Scripture where this preposition occurs, since the doctrine of the "indwelling of the Holy Spirit" has given it an importance which it would not otherwise have obtained or deserved, in order that it may be shown to have no solid foundation in the word of God. An examination, therefore, of the passages in which it occurs will show that wherever it is found, the words *ἐν ὑμῖν* may be properly translated *in you*; where the language or figure used requires this

preposition to be rendered by *in*, it will appear beyond all reasonable doubt, that the language is figurative; as, for instance: "My little children, of whom I travail in birth again until *Christ be formed in you*." Gal. iv: 19. And where the context requires that the words *ἐν ὑμῖν* shall be taken in their literal signification—where the language is *literal and not figurative*—the scope and thought of the passage will show that the preposition *ἐν* ought to be translated *among*; as for instance: "I will dwell and walk among them." 2 Cor. vi: 16.

The Apostle, in his letter to the church at Rome, when contrasting the law and the gospel, says: "For they who live according to the flesh, mind the things of the flesh; but they who live according to the Spirit, mind the things of the Spirit. * * * But you are not *in the flesh*, but *in the Spirit*, if, indeed, the Spirit of God dwell in you," (*ἐν ὑμῖν*.) In the ninth verse we have the preposition used three times, twice evidently figuratively, and once literally. "In the flesh," and "in the Spirit," are, unquestionably, figurative expressions. The last is to be taken literally, because it has reference to the fact that the Spirit dwells in the church, or with or among Christians. To be "*in the flesh*," is to mind the things of the flesh; and to be "*in the Spirit*," is to mind the things of the Spirit, or be guided by the teachings of the Spirit. We are not literally *in the Spirit*; nor is the Spirit ever literally in us; but we are said to *be in him*, and *he in us*, when we follow his teachings. Thus we are also said to dwell *in God*, and *God in us*, when we confess his name. 1 John iv: 15. When we regard and obey his commandments, we recognize his presence among us. More than this the passage does not teach; and this is in perfect harmony with the relation which the Spirit is declared to sustain to the church. It is in accordance with what Christ said when he promised to give the Spirit *to* his disciples.

In the same connection he further says: "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his. And if *Christ be in you*, the body is indeed dead, because of sin, but the Spirit is alive, because of righteousness. And if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead *dwell in you*, (*οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν*), he that raised up Christ from the dead will also make alive your mortal bodies, because of his Spirit that *dwells in you*." (*ἐν ὑμῖν*.) In this passage, the preposition *en* occurs three times, once in which the language is unquestionably figurative—"If *Christ be in you*"—and twice in which the language may be regarded as literal, in which case the preposition is translated *among*. No one will pretend to deny that to say the Spirit that dwells *among* you, is equally as good sense, and consistent with the scope and argument of the

passage, as to say, the Spirit that dwells in you. This being so, the passage can prove nothing in favor of the doctrine of the literal, or personal indwelling of the Spirit in the hearts of Christians. To be a *positive* proof, it must allow of no other rendering of the preposition than *in*; but, being doubtful, to say the least, the passage can afford no positive proof.

But it is evident, from the whole tenor and scope of the passage, that the Apostle was speaking of what blessings were positively secured to the Christian by the relation which he sustains through the Spirit to the Godhead. These are: 1. There is no *condemnation* to those who are *in* Christ Jesus. 2. That they are henceforth *led* by the Spirit of God; their whole mind and heart are turned to spiritual things; on these they meditate, and these they love; that, being thus led and influenced, the temper, mind, and disposition of Christ is formed in them; Christ is then said to be *in* them. This destroys the body of flesh; this breaks down its power over the soul, and leaves it dead, while the spirit is alive through righteousness. 3. Because the spirit of man is alive through righteousness, the body also shall be made alive; it shall be redeemed from the dominion of the grave; for God will raise it from the dead, as surely as he raised Christ. The life of the body is secured by the life of the spirit; and if the spirit be led by the Spirit of God, its life is placed beyond all contingency. He therefore declares if we are led and influenced and controlled by the Spirit of God, God will raise our dead bodies from the graves. "If the Spirit of him who raised up Jesus from the dead *dwells* among you, he will make alive your mortal bodies, because of his Spirit that dwells among you." If we are led by the Spirit, he dwells among us; and if he dwells among us, we are led by him; for he dwells with none but those who are obedient to his teaching. This we conceive to be the teaching of this passage of Scripture; and if this view of the doctrine of the passage be correct, it gives no countenance to the doctrine of the personal, or literal indwelling of the Spirit of God in the hearts or bodies of Christians.

The same thought this Apostle expresses in his letter to the Ephesians: "In whom also, after that you believed, you were *sealed with the Holy Spirit* of promise, who is the pledge of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession." Here, the relation between the Spirit and the Christian, is called a *sealing*, while in the Romans it is called a *dwelling*. But the same thought essentially is expressed. The Spirit of man being made alive through faith and obedience to Christ, the resurrection or life of the body is made sure to the spirit of man by the gift of the Holy Spirit. The life into which the Spirit of man is intro-

duced by faith and obedience is eternal life; and if the body be not raised from the dead, the separation between body and spirit must be final and eternal. But the gift of the Holy Spirit is a pledge against this, a security that God will raise our bodies from the grave. The relation, therefore, of the Holy Spirit, is with the spirit of man, and *not with his body*. It will go into the grave; but because the spirit is in union with the Holy Spirit—because it is in union with Christ, God will raise the body that it may live eternally with its spirit from which it was separated by death. This being the doctrine taught in the passage in Romans, the argument is just as strong and conclusive, to say the least of it, when the preposition is translated *among*, as when translated *in*. This being admitted, as it surely must, the passage can prove nothing in favor of the doctrine in question. On the contrary, to read, the Spirit dwells *among* you, is far more consistent with the relation which *persons* bear to each other.

We have said that, whenever the context requires the preposition *in*, in such connections as those already considered, to be translated by the English preposition *in*, it will be found that the language of the passage is figurative, and is designed to express the relation which the persons mentioned sustain to each other. No better illustration can, perhaps, be given of the truth of this remark, than the declaration of the Apostle John, when speaking of the relation that existed between Christ and his disciples. The relation existing between the sinner and the atonement—between the disciple and his master—between God and his children—between Christ and his church—between the Holy Spirit and Christians, is so close and intimate, that the strongest language is used to convey to our minds its nature and character—its richness and fullness. This is principally due to the fact, that the life of one is saved by the life of another; that the guilt of one is cancelled by the righteousness of another. This relation existing between the sinner and his sin-offering—between Christ and his disciples, is expressed by the Apostle John in this language: “And he who keeps his commandments *dwells in him, and he (Christ) in him*” (*ἐν αὐτῷ μένει, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν αὐτῷ*): and hereby we know that *he abides in us (μένει ἐν ἡμῖν)*, by the Holy Spirit whom he has given to us;” and, “If we love one another, God *dwells in us*, and his love is perfected in us. Hereby we know that *we dwell in him and he in us*, because he has given to us of his Holy Spirit;” and, “Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God *dwells in him, and he in God*.” and, “God is love; and he who dwells in love, dwells in God, and God in him.”

In the memoirs of our Lord, the same Apostle says: “*He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwells in me and I in him.*”

In his intercessory prayer, our Lord uses similar language to express the relation which exists between him and his Father, and between them and his disciples, and between the disciples themselves: "And I pray not for these alone, but for them also who shall believe on me through their word; *that they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us.*"

In these passages it is affirmed, 1st. That he who *keeps the commandments* of Christ, *dwells in Christ and Christ in him.* 2d. That if we *love one another*, God dwells in us. 3d. That we know that we dwell in him and he in us, because he has given to us the Holy Spirit. 4th. That whoever *confesses* that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwells in him, and he in God. 5th. That he who *dwells in love*, dwells in God, and God in him. 6th. That he who eats the flesh and drinks the blood of the Son of God, dwells in him and he in him; and 7th. He prays that all who shall believe on him through the words of the apostles, *may be one, and continue one in God and in Christ, as they are one.* No stronger language than this can be conceived by which to express the intimate union and relation that exist between God and Christ, and between these and the disciples, and between the disciples themselves. But no more is expressed, or intended to be expressed by this language, than the close and intimate relation that exists between a believer in Jesus Christ and the whole Godhead. *As God and Christ dwell in Christians, so does the Holy Spirit.* The relation between all the persons of the Divinity (*ὁ Θεός*), and the disciples of Christ, is the same; and as the relation between God and Adam, and between God and Israel, was *personal*; and as the relation between Christ and his disciples was also *personal*, it cannot be questioned that the relation which the Holy Spirit sustains to the church is also *personal*. The relation being *personal*, the conclusion follows irresistably, that the Holy Spirit dwells *among or with Christians*, and *not in them*. This is the relation that *persons* may sustain to each other, and the relation which they do sustain to each other when they *dwell together*.

Such a relation, such a union and communion with the Godhead, man's condition in this world demands. Helpless, he needs a protector; ignorant, he needs a teacher and a guide; sinful and sinning, he needs an intercessor; involved in the guilt of sin, he needs an atonement; and swayed by his passions, his spiritual powers weakened, he needs a power to enable him to subdue his revolting nature and enthrone his higher reason. All these he enjoys in virtue of his union with the Godhead, and the Holy Spirit is the Divine Person who is ever near him to be to him all that he needs. This union is not such as to impair his natural

powers, but rather to strengthen them. Man loses none of his natural powers or faculties. The Spirit interferes not with any of these. It is necessary that he should continue to possess these unimpaired, that he may with his own native powers, as a being having a will and self-determining powers, encounter the conflicts of life, and overcome the difficulties which beset him on all sides, on account of sin; and when and where he may prove too weak, the difficulties may be removed by the providences of the Spirit. If the Spirit of God *energize the spirit of man directly*, so that he shall be enabled to overcome the obstacles in his way, it is no longer the man that is the author of the will and deed, but the Spirit of God, and this at once destroys the true and essential nature of man; and nothing of merit or demerit can then be predicated of man's actions. But when the union is one of *relation*, and *not of possession*, then the Spirit of God influences the mind and will of men in accordance with the fundamental principles, or constitution of their organism, influences them in their thoughts and actions as one person among men or angles influences another, viz: through the established media of communication.

In view of the great *system* presented to us in the Holy Scriptures, the mind can discover no reason why the Holy Spirit should *dwell in Christians*—cannot see what can be gained by such an “indwelling,” more than is or can be enjoyed by his personal association with Christians, or his personal dwelling among or with them. It is not for enlightenment; for this we have shown is accomplished *only by the word of truth*, which the Spirit has inspired men to speak and write. It is not for the Christian's growth in the favor, love, and knowledge of God; for the Scriptures declare that this is effected by the word of truth also. It is not for comfort, exhortation, or consolation; for the Apostle declares that these also are accomplished by the divine word. And there being no conceivable object to be accomplished by an indwelling that is really a *possession*; and knowing that nothing is ever done unnecessarily by the Divine Being, we are compelled to reject the doctrine as unsustained, and uncountenanced by the Scriptures of divine truth.

On the other hand, there is much reason and necessity for his dwelling with or among Christians; because there is much to be done for them by the Spirit, which cannot be done by the truth alone, or by the truth at all. An instance of this we have seen in the examples already given of his providences. It is such wants and requirements of men that demand the constant presence in the church of the Holy Spirit. The interests of the cause of Christ in the world demand his constant presence. Even the wicked devices of men are to be made to serve the

cause of Christ. The events in the world's history are to be arranged with a special reference to the triumph of Christianity in the world, until the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of God and his Christ. Everything is to be made subservient to the church. The little stone that was cut out of the mountain is to break into pieces all other kingdoms, and fill the whole earth; and what God does by his providences with reference to this object, is done through, or by the Spirit. These necessities for the Spirit's presence, our enlightened reason can appreciate; and when our enlightened reason is satisfied, there must be a substantial basis for that satisfaction.

It is of immense strength and consolation to the enlightened and purified heart to know with absolute certainty that God and Christ, by the Holy Spirit, are ever near us, and around about us, watching over our interests, directing and leading us in the ways of righteousness and peace and holiness; protecting us from dangers, violence, and injury by day and by night, at home and abroad, on land and on sea, wherever and whenever we go. So David felt under the eye of God, when he sang, "I have set the Lord always before me: because he is on my right hand I shall not be moved. Therefore my heart is glad, and my glory rejoiceth." "I will not fear what man can do to me;" "yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil; for thou art with me; thy rod and thy staff, they comfort me;" "the Lord is the strength of my life; of whom shall I be afraid?" This was the strength of Paul in his greatest trials. At his first answer before Cesar, all forsook him. "Notwithstanding," he says, "the Lord stood by me, and strengthened me. The Lord will deliver me from every evil work, and will preserve me unto his heavenly kingdom." This is the assurance and consolation of every faithful disciple. The Lord is pledged to this. For the redemption of this pledge is the Holy Spirit given to the Christian. How it rejoices the heart and confirms the soul to know that the Holy Spirit is ever present with us, to execute the will of God towards us! It fixes the heart as upon a rock to know that we are not left orphans in this world of change, vicissitude and trial, exposed to the malignity and hatred of a sleepless and relentless foe, who exhausts every energy, and leaves no means in his power untried to accomplish our ruin. How the heart swells with joy, and how the soul renews and gathers its strength, to know that the Holy Spirit is with us as our Advocate, our Defender, all-powerful, ever watchful, earnestly and constantly seeking our present and eternal good! It binds the heart with inseparable cords to know that the Holy Spirit is ever near us, searching our hearts to know their rising and earliest wants,

that he may supplicate the Father in our behalf, that he will grant us such things as our helpless and mercy-inspiring condition in life demands; that he stands ready to bear the answer of God, and to be the minister of God in conveying to us the blessings we so much need. The Christian can rejoice with the sweet Psalmist of Israel, and say with him: "The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want. He maketh me to lie down in green pastures; he leadeth me by the still waters. He restoreth my soul; he leadeth me in the paths of righteousness for his name's sake. Yea, though I walk through the valley and shadow of death, I will fear no evil: for thou art with me; thy rod and thy staff, they comfort me." "They that *wait upon the Lord* shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run, and not be weary; they shall walk, and not faint."

SIGMA.

SIGMA'S ARTICLE.—For the present we shall express no opinion as to the main position of Sigma's article. Whether sound or unsound we say not now. In the next number of the Quarterly, however, we expect to subject it to a sifting. We ask for the piece a most thoughtful reading, and, in the meantime, a thorough investigation of the vitally important topic to which it relates. The article is written in a fine calm spirit, and is the product of a scholarly Christian gentleman. Though independent, and thinking for himself, he is no dogmatist. Jealous of the truth, he has said what he has said in the conscientious belief that he is right. This entitles him to a most patient hearing.

The question of Spiritual influence, whether it relates to the sinner or the Christian, has a deep significance for the student of Holy Writ. Let us evince no impatience to have it hastily decided. It merits and needs the most searching, and protracted examination. From the result we, as a people, have nothing to fear. Truth and not error is the pearl we seek at every cost whether of thought or time. Only in this, as in all other questions, let us be careful that our final conclusions have certainly the sanction of the Bible. Beyond its limits we must not go. Within them much may yet remain to be learned; but unless clearly within them, no thought, however plausible, must be cherished by us even for a moment.

BAPTISM—MEANING OF THE WORD.

THAT the meaning of the word baptism is not yet settled, is a simple well known fact. Whether its meaning is really in doubt, may be well questioned. That it is so in appearance is certain. I cannot admit that any one who is honest and competent, and who has given to the word the necessary attention, can be in doubt as to its true meaning. Yet many persons seem to be in doubt as to its import; but these, if sincere, belong not to the class of whom I am speaking. They belong to the class who accept their religious convictions at second hand, and never form them for themselves. Honest they may be, but this alters not the case. On the other hand, some seem to hold the meaning of the word as settled, but as settled in favor of sprinkling and pouring. If these actually believe what they affect to believe, they believe it on the ground that persons willingly under a delusion, may "believe a lie" as really as others believe the truth. The belief in both cases is real, only in the one case it is the belief of a lie, in the other, the belief of the truth. One fact, however, is certain, no matter from what circumstance it springs, that the import of the word is not settled, but is still in debate.

Nor from the manner in which the question is usually discussed, does it seem likely soon to be settled. This I do not admit to be due to any defect in the method of investigation employed, but to perverseness in rejecting its conclusions. The method heretofore adopted consists, in the main, in the use of *authorities*. One man cites his lexicon to prove that the word means exclusively to immerse: another cites his, to prove that it may have another meaning. One cites his classic authority to show that the word means only to dip: another cites his, to set this aside. Church history is arrayed against church history; commentary against commentary; and thus the controversy seems endless. I am free to confess that I never expect to see the controversy settled according to this method. Indeed, I never expect to see it settled according to any method as long as frail humanity can be influenced to reject the truth. Again, the sound arguments employed in the case have become so speciously counterfeited that it requires so much skill to distinguish the true argument from the false that I have despaired of its ever being done completely.

Still, it does not strike me as at all probable that, in a matter of so much moment as baptism, Christ has left us wholly dependent on the lexicon for his meaning. Yet such may be the case as

we know it is in many other instances. Believing, therefore, that the New Testament itself contains materials from which the exact meaning of the word can be collected, I propose in this piece to examine them. My method may appear new, still, if it has real merit, it is not to be objected to on that score. My object is to produce an argument which, while claiming to be conclusive, shall be adapted to the common mind. In executing the task, no attempt will be made at classic elegance. My illustrations shall be of the humblest type; and in using them, I shall gladly incur the charge of being tedious, if I can only be clear, and even of being vulgar, if I can only be successful.

In all questions respecting a word, we distinguish between the word proper and that which it expresses. The word itself is one thing; that for which it stands a different thing; and these two things we separate, mentally, at least, and conceive of both as distinct entities. Accordingly, the present inquiry relates not to the mere word baptism, but to *that* for which it stands, *the thing* which it expresses. Of course it will not be denied that this thing, whatever it is, is baptism.

But here a preliminary inquiry demands notice. Much has been said on the generic and specific imports of baptism. I wish first to determine its generic import; and with a view to this shall cite the following passage: "And Jesus came and spake to them saying, all power is given to me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, *baptizing* them in the name of the Father," &c. What, now, is the generic meaning of the word baptizing? This is the question for the present. When I say of a man, he is *walking*, to an English ear it is intuitively certain that the word walking expresses *action*; and when I say of a farmer, he is plowing, it is not less certain that the word plowing expresses action. Not only do these words express action, but action is their most comprehensive meaning; it is hence their generic meaning. Equally certain is it, when I say of a man, he is baptizing, that the word baptizing expresses action; and since action is its most comprehensive meaning, *it is therefore its generic meaning*. Where words have both a generic and a specific meaning, as is the case with walking, plowing, baptizing, and indeed with all words belonging to the class of active verbs, it is perhaps more correct to say that they *imply* their generic meaning, than that they express it. Indeed, they do not express it, at least directly. What they express directly is their specific meaning, which is the single act denoted by each in a given connection. They imply, then, the generic meaning, and express directly the specific one. Had the distinction here pointed out been perceived and steadily kept before the mind in discussions respecting bap-

tism, it would have narrowed the field of dispute very much, and brought the parties at once together. For example, heretofore, in discussions on this subject, Pedobaptists have generally taken the position that baptism is not a specific, but a generic term, meaning to *wash*, or simply *any application of water*; while we have usually taken the ground that it is not a generic, but a specific term, meaning to immerse. Now, had we conceded that the word has really a generic import, and shown that this is *action*—a fact which our opponents could not have denied—they would then have been compelled either to maintain that the word has two generic meanings, which it has not, or to admit that wash is specific. Then would have risen the question which of two specific meanings, wash, and immerse, is the true one, or the one directly expressed by the word? We have been right in affirming that the word is specific, but wrong in denying that it is also generic. Pedobaptists have been right in affirming that the word is generic, but wrong, first, in assigning its generic meaning, and, second, in denying that it is also specific. I repeat, they have been wrong in assigning its generic meaning. Wash is not a generic term to any mind except that of a Pedobaptist. It is as specific in its import as is the word dip or sprinkle. In proof of this, take the familiar example, I wash my hands. Here the word is obviously specific, since it expresses directly a simple individual act. Clearly it is as much so as the word sprinkle and dip in the similar expressions, I sprinkle my hands, I dip my hands.

The word baptism, then, is a generic term, and its generic meaning is action. Now, since we hold that it is also specific, that is, that it expresses directly a single individual act which is its true meaning, the question arises, what is that act? For this question we are not yet ready.

The word baptism is also employed to denote the rite or ordinance of baptism. I need hardly stop to remind the reader that an ordinance is simply something established by authority or appointed to be done. Now let no one suppose, because the word is employed to denote the ordinance of baptism, that therefore the ordinance is one thing, and the specific act expressed by the word, a different thing. Such supposition would not be correct. The specific act expressed by the word is itself the thing appointed or ordained to be done. But since this act is to be performed thus and so or to be attended by its appropriate ceremonies, it is to the act thus attended that we apply the epithet ordinance or rite, rather than to the naked act itself.

Further, though the action expressed by the word baptism has no original and necessary connection with water, yet it is uniformly connected with it in the New Testament. The few excep-

tional cases recorded, being in fact instances of the figurative use of the word, and not of its ordinary use as denoting the rite. Hence, in every case where the word occurs, the presumption is that the act it expresses is there connected with water; and so strong is this presumption that nothing but indisputable facts to the contrary can set it aside.

I am now prepared for the question—if the word baptism is specific, what is the act which it directly expresses? I do not, it will be perceived, affirm the word to be specific, neither do I take it for granted; on the contrary, I merely assume it, leaving subsequent investigations to determine whether the assumption is well taken or not. We consequently have now before us a question involving a single point to which our future labor is steadily to look. As containing the matter which is to furnish the solution to this question, I cite the following passage:

“What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid. How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein? Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.” Rom. vi: 1-4.

From this paragraph I select the following clause to which the reader's attention is specially invited: “*Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death.*” As it is very important that the precise point on which my argument is to rest, shall be placed distinctly before the mind, I shall, for this purpose, omit from the clause such words and phrases as involve nothing material to the present investigation. Accordingly, I omit the word “therefore,” the phrase “with him,” and the expression “into death.” We then, have: “*We are buried by baptism.*” This, with Pedobaptists is a tough saying. It has cost them immense labor, and given them great pain; and yet they have not succeeded in getting rid of the obstinate thing.

Now in what acceptation must we take the clause, “we are buried by baptism?” Must we take it in a literal or in a figurative sense? This is now the question to be settled. If we take the clause literally, then the controversy respecting the act denoted by the word baptism is at an end. That act is a burying which, when connected with water, is immersion. This no one can be bold enough to deny.

But Pedobaptists generally affirm that we must take the clause, not literally, but figuratively. Now, I am curious to know what has suggested this view with so much unanimity to their minds? Is it so that immersion is really offensive to them, and that there-

fore they wish to get rid of it? If not, how shall we account for their persistent refusal to allow any Scripture to be literal which seems to favor it? The truth in reply to these questions is unfortunate. Pedobaptist children are trained from their cradle to look upon immersion with aversion, to regard it as a vulgar indocent thing. From their parents' lips they imbibe the belief that it is not taught in the Bible, and that only the ignorant and unrefined practice it. No wonder then that, when grown, they should falsify the pages of Holy Writ to sustain the parental tradition. But had the form of the clause (they will forgive the hypothesis) been negative and not affirmative, had it read, we are *not* buried by baptism, how then would they have construed it, literally or figuratively? Or had it contained the word sprinkle instead of the word "buried" as a qualification of baptism, how then would have stood the case? A child could then have decided that the clause must be taken literally! But, even granting to them what they claim, that the clause is figurative, and this by no means relieves them from difficulty. Of course the clause still has meaning, only it has a figurative meaning: the question then is what is its meaning? To this question Pedobaptists have as yet furnished no uniform answer, nor one in any large measure satisfactory even to themselves, to say nothing of others.

But I must here relate an incident which took place in my early life, and which well illustrates the conduct and perplexities of Pedobaptists in regard to the clause: It had been for some time previously announced that a discourse would be delivered by a certain celebrated preacher, on "the mode of baptism," as it was phrased. I heard the effort. When the speaker, after many ins and outs, curious turns, and crooked bouts, on other themes and matter, came to the clause, "we are buried by baptism," he paused and smiled; and there was logic in his pause and demonstration in his smile. He then gracefully waved his hand over the audience (for he was a graceful man), and said: "Why this clause lends no countenance to the cause of the immersionists. *It is all figurative.*" The air with which this was uttered was exquisite; and any one inclined to rest the issue on looks and smiles and manual curves would have said, the controversy is ended. It so happened that I took dinner at the same house with the speaker, who was not greatly my senior in years. I said to him: Did I not understand you to say that the clause "we are buried by baptism," is figurative? "You did," was his curt reply. I continued: I then take for granted that you know what the clause means; for if not, for aught you know it may be literal. "I think I do," was the modest but composed reply. I then asked

the gentleman of the house for a piece of paper, and on it wrote down the clause, "we are buried by baptism," spacing well the words. This paper I now handed to the speaker, saying: Sir, I am no scholar, and therefore ask of you a little aid. Be kind enough to write down under it the literal meaning of each word in the clause, so that I may have plainly expressed what the clause means. Then, for the first time, the speaker discovered that although his education was respectable in other respects, there was one sad elipsis in it: *he could not write*—at least he did not. It is an easy thing to assert of a disagreeable passage that it is figurative; but not always quite so easy to write its meaning down. Let those who so affirm of the clause in hand, make the experiment, and much of their folly will find correction in the attempt. Had we the views written out of twenty different men who affirm of this clause that it is figurative, they would, on being compared, present a curious medley of orthodoxy, evasion, and nonsense.

Still it is possible that the clause may be figurative. If so, however, since it is obviously not an attempt to clothe a prophetic conception in the drapery of daring symbol, but the simple statement of a matter of fact familiar to the experience of ancient Christians, we may be able to ascertain its meaning. It will be observed that as yet I have spoken of the clause only as a whole, and not of its individual terms. Is it, then, as a whole, to be taken figuratively? Clearly not; for the words "we," "are," and "by" cannot be so taken. Hence the clause, as a whole, cannot be taken figuratively. But may it not contain figurative words? Certainly it may; but this would by no means justify us in saying of the clause, as a whole, that it is figurative. So far, then, the most that can possibly be said of the clause on any ground, is that it may be partly literal and partly figurative. For the present, then, I am done with the clause as a whole; and shall now proceed to consider its individual terms, with the view of ascertaining if any of these be figurative, and if so, which ones.

By the way, the practice of affirming of a whole clause or sentence that it is figurative, seems to have been adopted as a convenient method either of getting rid of the sometimes perplexing question, what does the clause or sentence mean? or of avoiding or hiding a disagreeable sense. The method may have accomplished the latter result, but certainly it has not the former. For, when a man affirms of a clause that it is figurative, the fair presumption is that he knows its meaning; in which case he is certainly bound to point it out. If he fails to do this, he subjects himself to the suspicion of having made his affirmation with a sinister intent. True, in some cases words or phrases are known

to be figurative where their exact sense is completely hid. But these are exceptions to the general rule.

But I return to the consideration of the single or individual words of the clause in hand. First, then, in what acceptation must we take the word "buried"? Must we take it in a literal or in a figurative sense? Surely this question cannot be answered arbitrarily. We certainly are not at liberty to take a word literally or the reverse merely at will. If we take a word figuratively, it must be for a sufficient reason; and if no such reason exists, the word is not to be so taken. Under what circumstances, then, are we to abide by the literal or current meaning of a word, and when is it to be taken figuratively? A more important question than this respecting verbal criticism cannot well be conceived. The answer to the question will be found in the following rule:

A word must be taken in its literal or current meaning, unless the nature of the case or a qualifying epithet forbids it.

To this rule there is not an exception in universal speech. Now, respecting the word "buried," two questions arise: First, what is its literal or current meaning? Second, Must we take it in that meaning? The current meaning of the word is certainly this: to put the body of a person dead in a grave in the earth and cover it up. When we hear the word buried or burial pronounced unattended by any qualifying circumstance, this clearly is what we collect from it. When used to denote a burial in anything else than earth, or of anything else than a body, the word must be so qualified as to indicate the fact, otherwise we invariably take it in the sense just defined. The following interview will render this plain:

Jay said to Tell: "Whence do you come?" Tell replied: "From Lee's; and while there I attended a burial at his house." Here the interview was suddenly interrupted, no explanation having been added. Now, so clear and simple is the statement of Tell that it would seem impossible to misapprehend it. Indeed, we feel perfectly certain that we understand it. But in a short time Jay met Lee and asked him: "Who was buried at your house to-day?" Lee replied: "No one; there has never been a burial at my house." Jay was at a loss to account for Tell's statement, knowing him to be a man of strict veracity. While revolving the matter in his mind Tell came up. Jay said to him: "Did you not tell me that you attended a burial at Lee's to-day?" "I did," was Tell's reply. Jay then said to Lee: "did you not say that no one had been buried at your house to-day, or at any other time?" Lee replied, "I did." Now the contradiction here seems to be point blank and irreconcilable. But Tell said to Lee: "Do

you not remember that while at your house you and I walked into the garden, and that while there you took a spade and buried a *seed* of some kind in the ground beside a shrub near where we stood?" Lee replied: "Certainly, I remember that perfectly." "Very well," Tell continued, "was not that a burial?" Of course it was, is the only answer that can be conceived. Now, although the burial in this case was not only real, but as literal as though it had been the burial of a human body, still the mind is not satisfied with Tell's explanation. It sounds as though intended to be sharp. But wherefore the perplexity and want of satisfaction in the case? Clearly from this: that the word burial has a well known current meaning in which Tell did not use it; and failing to do this, he should have subjoined the necessary qualification which he neglected to do. His language should have been: I attended the burial of a *seed in the garden*. The clause in italics would then have so qualified the word that no misapprehension could have occurred.

It is not, perhaps, strictly correct to say that the word buried or burial means all that I have defined it to mean. Indeed, it does not mean it, that is, all of it. The word means simply and strictly *the act*, burying, and nothing more; and hence in reality excludes both the thing buried and the element or material buried in. We have, however, from habit come to *associate* with the word the notion of a human body and a grave in the earth. But these elements belong not strictly to the word. In the preceding instance, therefore, Tell's language was strictly correct; only it carried not all that we usually associate with the word. Still when a word has come even from association to convey to the mind a certain meaning, if at any time it be used in a different sense, due notice must be given of the fact, otherwise confusion will inevitably result. Neither are we at liberty to affix meanings to words arbitrarily. When a word has once become current, and its meaning settled, we have no right to change or alter such settled meaning. Such right would imply that there is no validity in a contract, no truth in history, and no consistency in reason. If I purchase from a mechanic a cart, he has no right to send me a clock, alleging that he means by the word cart a clock. When I say that Philip was Alexander's father, another has not the right to say that the word father denotes merely a teacher; and that therefore Alexander was not the son of Philip, but Philip merely the teacher of Alexander. Again, if I say things which are equal to the same third are equal to one another, no one has the right to say that the word equal denotes not equality but mere resemblance, and that therefore my assertion is false. Hence we cannot arbitrarily alter the import of words.

But still the question returns, in what acceptation shall we take the word "buried" in the clause "we are buried by baptism?" Certainly, since we cannot affix to it an arbitrary meaning, we must take it in its ordinary or current sense, unless the nature of the case or a qualifying epithet forbids it. But this does not yet answer the question. In order to do this, it will be necessary to ascertain, first, how many items enter into a burial; and, second, in what and how many respects one burial may differ from another. First, then, in every burial there are three and only three items, to-wit: 1st. The thing buried. 2d. The act—burying. 3d. The element or material buried in. Second, one burial may differ from another: 1st, In regard to the thing buried: we may bury a body or bury a seed. 2d, In regard to the element or material buried in: we may bury in earth or bury in water. In these two respects one burial may differ from another, *but never in the third*. For, if in the third, then one is a burial and the other is not.

I am now fully prepared for the question, can we take the word "buried," in the clause in hand, in its ordinary acceptation? I answer, we certainly cannot. For the burial which the word here denotes differs from the ordinary burial as to the thing buried—the subject of the common burial being *a lifeless body*, the subject of this being "*we*," i. e. *living men and women*. Again, this burial is effected in or by baptism, which is not true of the ordinary burial. Therefore the word "buried" in the clause in hand, denotes not the ordinary burial, but a burial differing from it. *Still, however, it denotes a burial*. But this burial differs from the common burial in two respects, and agrees with it only in the third—it differs as to the subject and element, and agrees as to the act. Now the act is the only absolutely essential unvarying item in a burial. In all other respects burials may differ, but never in this. The act cannot be dispensed with, for then we have no burial. Hence, since in the clause, "we are buried by baptism," the word "buried" denotes *the act*—the one essential, unvarying item in a burial, it therefore denotes a burial in the truest and strictest sense of the word. We are therefore actually, literally, and truly buried in baptism. What, now, is the act expressed by the word baptism? It is a burying. In what element is this act performed? The reply is, water. *Hence baptism is a burying in water—in other words, it is immersion*.

It would indeed be difficult to account for Paul's language, "we are buried by baptism," if the idea of burying is not inherent, essentially and always in baptism. If the idea is ever, from any cause, absent from the word, how could the Apostle assert as he has, when his assertion might be false? The truth of his state-

ment can never be vindicated upon the hypothesis that either sprinkling or pouring can complement the word.

I next proceed to the word "baptism," and ask, as in the preceding case, in what acceptation shall we take it? I answer, in its common current sense, unless the nature of the case or some other adequate circumstance forbids it. What then is its current sense? Before answering this question, I wish to dispose of another, of no great moment, I grant, but still sometimes asked, namely: is baptism an English word? For the sake of being brief I shall grant that it is. Certainly it was not so originally; but this is not the question. It is found in all our English dictionaries, is current in English literature, and is constantly upon the lip in daily conversation. It is therefore an English word. Whether its current English meaning is the same as its ancient Greek meaning, which is certainly its only true one, is a question I do not propose to raise, but one involving a point which I shall by no means concede. I can well believe that it has not, as an English word, the same meaning that it had in the lips of Christ. Modern parties have dealt with it much as wicked Jews dealt with him. They have compelled it to carry a meaning on which they have well-nigh succeeded in crucifying it. But still the question remains unanswered, what is the current meaning of the word? I reply: its common current meaning, as an English word, is to *immerse*, *sprinkle*, or *pour*. Of course it will be understood that these acts are performed either in or with water, and in such other respects as are essential to baptism.

That the meaning I have assigned to the word is its current meaning with Pedobaptists at least, cannot be denied. Still the point must not be so briefly disposed of. Ask a Pedobaptist for the meaning of the word, and what is his response? Usually, perhaps invariably, that it means either to immerse, or sprinkle, or pour. But do they in answering thus, answer truly, or do they, in other words, believe their own reply? I am satisfied they do not. It will be noticed that in their reply they use the words immerse, sprinkle, pour. These they connect by the particle *or*—making immerse *or* sprinkle *or* pour. Now does this give the true import of the word baptism? Do Pedobaptists themselves believe it? Let the question be tested.

Suppose an act is committed, no matter what, and the question is by whom? The reply is, by Jay or Tell or Lee. Here, also, we have three names, Jay, Tell, Lee, connected by the particle *or*, making Jay *or* Tell *or* Lee. Now let it be established that Jay committed the act, and of necessity Tell and Lee are excepted. In like manner, since it is asserted that baptism means to immerse or sprinkle or pour, let it be settled that it means to

immerse, and of course sprinkling and pouring are excluded. Is this the position of Pedobaptists? Certainly not, they will tell you; and yet this is their language. Will they then abandon the position? No. They will modify their language and abide by the position still. But in representing Pedobaptists as holding that baptism means to immerse or sprinkle or pour, I may possibly not be doing them justice. Or perhaps their own language may be slightly at fault. If so, I am not inclined to hold them to a very strict account for it; as we are all liable to commit unimportant verbal blunders, and hence in such matters need to be dealt with in charity. Let me now proceed to collect their meaning in a way entirely unexceptionable even to them.

I have, suppose, a neighbor, an amiable man and a preacher, but one who differs from me in regard to baptism. He is conducting a protracted meeting. We chance to meet when he remarks to me: "I have a baptism to perform to-day, will you be present?" I reply, certainly, sir, where do you baptize? "At the creek," he responds, at the same time designating the place. At the time appointed I repair to the creek, and find my neighbor and the man to be baptized standing on its bank. They descend into the water; when my neighbor with uplifted hand, pronounces the usual solemn form of words, and *immerses* the man. On coming up from the water, I approach my neighbor and say; tell me, sir, why you *immersed* the man? He replies, "I immersed the man because immersion is in the word baptism as part of its meaning." A more appropriate answer no one can imagine. For if immersion is not in the word baptism as an integral part of its meaning, then it is intuitively certain that my neighbor, whatever else he may have done, has not performed a baptism.

But another day has past, when I again meet my neighbor and inquire as to the success of his meeting. He informs me that he has another baptism to perform, and invites me to be present. I consent, but learn that this time the baptism takes place in the church. At the appointed time I attend. My neighbor and the man to be baptized are present; and close beside them on a stand sits a bowl filled with clean water. My neighbor arises, lifts his hand, and pronouncing the same solemn form of words as on yesterday, says, "I baptize you," and *sprinkles* the water upon the man. I again approach my neighbor and ask: why did you sprinkle the man? He answers: "I sprinkled the man because sprinkling is inherent in the word baptism as part of its meaning."

The same thing is enacted on the third day. But this time instead of sprinkling the man my neighbor picks up the bowl and *pours* the water on him. I ask the same question: he gives the same answer.

Now all this clearly corresponds with the common current acceptation of the word. It is, in other words, the orthodox Pedobaptist view and practice. Very well, then, the word baptism does not mean to immerse *or* sprinkle *or* pour, but to immerse *and* sprinkle *and* pour. It therefore includes *three* acts and not one.

Let the reader now conceive the word baptism with its contents to be lifted from the sacred page and placed in the line beneath his eye. These contents, it will be remembered, are immerse, sprinkle, and pour. Next, as a cover is lifted from a vessel, let me lift the word baptism off its contents leaving these behind in the line. And this we can do; for in the outset we settled that a word is one thing, its contents a different thing; and that these can be separated, one from the other, mentally at least, and both be conceived of as distinct things. After removing the word baptism we have left, immerse, sprinkle, and pour. These are its contents and are all *acts*. In this respect, then, my original condition is complied with; for I set out with it as an intuition that the word baptism denotes action. Let it now be constantly borne in mind that these *three* acts are, according to its Pedobaptist acceptation, the contents of the word baptism. They are, in other words, its real meaning, the true essential baptism appointed by Christ.

I now transcribe the following from the letter to the Ephesians: "There is one body and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling, one Lord, one faith, *one baptism*, one God and Father of all." There is, then, *one* baptism and no more; not, of course, one word called baptism, but one thing denoted by the word, called one baptism. The expression "one baptism" unitizes actually and forever, the conception expressed by the word. When the Apostle says there is "one God," he means one and no more—absolutely one. And so, when he says there is "one baptism," the thing itself is one, essentially and forever *one*. Is it action, as we have certainly seen it is? Then it is one action. Whatever the word stands for is *one*, one thing, one conception, one act. Duality, triality, plurality are excluded; unity alone remains. Produce the meaning of the word; *one* may be predicated of it, nay, indeed, must be and exhausts it. Determine what the word stands for; one is applicable to it and will cover it; we can place the word one on it, just as on the body, making "one body," or on the Spirit, making "one Spirit."

But what is the meaning of the word, what its contents, according to Pedobaptist usage? They are immerse, sprinkle, pour; and these are three things, three acts, separate and distinct. Let us now try to place the word one on these contents—try to fit or match it to these three acts. Can we do it? With the word one

between my fingers I make the trial. There is one—one—one. It is impossible. The acts themselves are *three*; how can they, then, be *one*? How now shall we dispose of the case? The word one must be placed on these contents, and can be, provided they are truly contents of the word baptism. The Apostle himself placed it on them, and so can we, provided we do as he did. I repeat the trial and fail. Something is wrong, something at fault, clearly so. Of course it is not the word "one." May it not, then, be in these contents? Let us now inspect them; especially let us remember that these are the contents of baptism, not according to Christ or Paul, but according to Pedobaptists only. Ah! I have it at last. I can place the word one on these contents now, but will take them one at a time. First, then, let me remove immerse and pour. Only sprinkle is left. The task is now easy. There is one sprinkling. A child can do this. But with equal ease and in the same way I can place the word one also on immerse and pour, making one immersion, one pouring. There is, then, one immersion, one sprinkling, and one pouring. Now perhaps this is what Pedobaptists mean when they say that baptism signifies to immerse or sprinkle or pour. They mean that the word signifies *any one* of these three acts. But this is not true. They do not mean that it signifies *any* one, or merely *some* one, of these acts, but that it signifies them all. They are all therefore included in the word baptism, constituting and exhausting its meaning. Hence jointly and together they constitute the one baptism; not any one of them is that baptism, but together they are it. Is any one, then, baptized who is merely sprinkled? Certainly not; for sprinkling is not the one baptism, but only a part of it; and the part of a thing is not the whole. Neither is he baptized who is merely immersed, and the same is true of pouring. Consequently no one is baptized unless he has been immersed, sprinkled, and had the water poured on him. Such is the inevitable result of the Pedobaptist theory of baptism.

But, since the word baptism stands for one thing or one act, whatever it be, and not three; and since the word one can with equal facility be placed on any one of the three acts, immerse, sprinkle or pour, the question arises, since only one of these acts is to be retained, which one shall it be? Nor can this question be answered arbitrarily.

This leads me to return to the clause, well-nigh forgotten by this time, perhaps, "we are buried by baptism." Of course the Apostle does not, in this language, refer to the mere word baptism, but to its contents or the action it expresses. What these contents are according to Pedobaptist usage we know, namely, immerse, sprinkle, pour. In order to ascertain which one of these

three acts is to be retained and which two excluded, let me repeat each in connection with this clause. First. "We are buried by" sprinkling. It is absolutely false. We are not buried by sprinkling in any conceivable sense, not even in part. Hence sprinkling is no part of the meaning of baptism; and is therefore to be excluded. Second. "We are buried by" pouring. It is not so. We are buried by pouring in no sense, not even in part. Therefore pouring is no part of what baptism signifies; and is hence to be excluded. Consequently, as far as sprinkling and pouring are concerned, the Pedobaptist view of baptism is wholly false.

From the premises now before us, it will be perceived that we have three items or circumstances to guide us to a correct conclusion, and protect us against error. We have, first, by intuition that baptism expresses action; second, by divine authority the word "one" to unitize the act; and, third, by same, the word "buried," to determine precisely what the act is. Now while we wrought with only two of these, to-wit: *action* and "*one*," we could determine nothing as to the relative claims of immerse, sprinkle, and pour. But as soon as we introduced the third item, namely, "*buried*," it excluded instantly and forever two of these, leaving only one remaining. And clearly not one of these three items can be dispensed with. They all pertain directly to baptism, serving, each in its own proper way, to determine what it is.

But again, and finally, baptism according to Pedobaptist acceptation, means also to immerse. I now, consequently, try immersion just as sprinkling and pouring were tried. Accordingly I have: "*We are buried by*" *immersion*. Precisely so. This is the very thing done in immersion.

Here, now, I must refer again to my original condition, combine anew my items, and see if they will form one consistent whole. First, then, the word baptizing (which is merely baptism with its form, not its sense, changed), denotes *action*. This is intuitively certain. And immerse expresses action. It therefore complies with my original condition. Second, this action is "*one*" action; and immerse expresses a single act. Thus far, then, the argument is complete. Substituting, now, act for action, and we have "*one baptism*," one act. Combining now with my only remaining item, and we have, "*buried by one baptism*," buried by one act; and since baptism is always and inseparably connected with water, we therefore have, *buried by one act in water*. Add to this the Apostle's expression in Colossians: "*in which*" (baptism—act) "*ye are risen*," and we finally have: "*buried by one baptism*" —*buried by one act in water in which we are risen*. The conclusion is overwhelming—*this is immersion*.

Now I hold that in these items and circumstances we have a

definition of the word baptism more severe, precise, and better guarded than we could possibly have had in any single equivalent word. With these premises before him and understood, no man, it seems to me, can be in doubt as to the meaning of baptism. Let him who has heeded these reasonings, take the expression: "we are buried by baptism," let him enter his closet, bow his knee, lay his hand on his heart, lift his eyes to God, and say, if never immersed—I *have been buried by baptism*. I should regret to know that the being lives on earth who could attempt the deed.

Only two points now remain to be briefly noticed. First. Is the word "buried" a correct rendering of the Greek original? I reply, it is not only a correct rendering, but *the* correct rendering. The Greek word can be translated by no term except buried or a term exactly equivalent to it.

Second. In the sentence, "we are buried with him by baptism into death," do not the phrases "with him" and "into death," so modify and define the words "buried" and "baptism," as to forbid their being taken in the sense we have attached to them? Clearly not. For the phrase "with him" serves merely to connect the party buried with Christ, but in no sense to define the word buried. In like manner, the phrase "into death" merely states the end attained by the burying or its result, but in no possible way defines or qualifies it.

Consequently the clause "we are buried by baptism" stands as the divine, literal, exact definition of the word baptism which, when connected with water, is *immersion*.

BETHANY COLLEGE.—We mean no disrespect to other Institutions, nor any idle compliment to the one we here so briefly notice, when we call the especial attention of our brotherhood to Bethany College, as having high and primary claims to their patronage. For long years it has been working to give the chief distinction to the Bible as a text book in education, and to provide the world with a preacherhood in some measure fitted and worthy to plead the claims of that great book. How well it has succeeded we as a people at least know. During the last three years, notwithstanding the rage of strife and passion in the land, on it has held its uniform and consistent course. For well-nigh nothing its accomplished and disinterested Faculty have wrought for the cause of Christ, and the good of the youth of the country. Surely an Institution and men that do this are entitled to our highest respect and sympathy. Shall they have them? We ask of our brethren, when providing for the education of their sons, to remember with fitting consideration Bethany College; and we ask this with heart and feeling.

THE CHRISTIAN NAME.

MANY have been the theories offered to the brethren in reference to the person or persons who gave the name Christian to the disciples at Antioch, and we do not think that the subject has yet been fully explored. There are depths in this ocean of disputation not touched by us. The gist of the controversy, chiefly has turned upon the grammatical construction of the sentence in Acts xi: 26, and the meaning of the word *Chrematisai*. Exegesis, or the science of interpretation, is invaluable, but it does not always settle questions in dispute, though it may silence objections. We think that many passages of Scripture have been eviscerated by the critical knife of the school-man; and whilst we are left to admire the skill and adroitness with which the work has been done, we have looked with feelings of pity and much of regret, at the lifeless form which they have left on the table. They have done up their work most scientifically, but they have given us, as the result of their labors, a dead carcass. Analysis of a few words in a passage of Scripture, or of any writing, often fails in giving its true meaning; and this, too, even when it is guided by correct principles and used by a masterly hand. The whole scope of the passage often settles its meaning, when science overlooks and fails to reach it. It is surprising how a word, an incident, or a fact not hitherto considered, will relieve a subject of all its difficulties, and throw into the shade all the rubbish which has been chipped around it.

An old colored woman in the south has done more to settle the question, "*who* was immersed, Philip or the Eunuch," which the learned Dr. Adam Clark has mystified by his scholarly pen, than all the Doctors of Divinity known. Her mistress had been troubled on the subject of immersion, and had listened to a Pedobaptist minister, who substantially gave Adam Clark's exegesis of Acts viii: 38. She returned home with her conscience somewhat pacified; and was exulting over the fact of the little importance to be attached to baptism, inasmuch as it was not known and could not be known who was baptized, Philip or the Eunuch! And therefore she would not trouble herself any more about it. The old Baptist colored woman heard what she said, and was surprised at her ignorance, and that of the preacher, and answered, "I can tell who it was who was baptized on that occasion, sure." "What do you know about it?" said her mistress. "I know enough for that." "Well then tell us," said she laughingly. "Why," said the old lady, "*it was the man that asked for the water.*"

This settles the question forever; but Adam Clark's exegesis could not, did not, and yet it is quite learned.

I have read carefully the commentary of Bro. McGarvey on Acts xi: 26, in which the Christian name for the first time in the New Testament occurs, and his reason for it. The whole article is admirably written, and deserves to be studied. We thank him for the history—shall we say the philosophy—of the several names and designations given to the followers of Christ. It is most satisfactory and refreshing. Certainly, nothing was more reasonable than that they should, first, have been called *disciples*, because of their relation to the Great *Teacher*; and that, in closer relationship to him and to each other, they should have been called *brethren*, recognizing him as the Elder Brother, and each other as belonging to the same family; and that, in due process of time, they should have been called *Children of God*, in acknowledgment of their higher relationship to one Father—“*Our Father*”—and that in consequence of their deep consecration to God and their separation from the world, they should have found their place among the holy ones—“*the saints*” of all ages spoken of in the Old Testament. “But,” he says, “when they were spoken of with the most general reference to their great leader, they were called *Christians*.” Now this but partially, and in too “general” terms, gives the reason for the name, as it occurred in Antioch. We think that the knot can be untied, and that without much labor.

Let us give a resume of the different theories already before the public, and offer an additional one. “It was given, by way of reproach, by Jews or Gentiles, or both, to the disciples at Antioch.” This has had many defenders, and some, I think, among our brethren. “It was given by the disciples themselves, as the patronymic of their body.” This has had a few supporters, with some show of zeal in its defense. But the third and last, has called out the largest number of advocates, viz: “That it was given by Barnabas and Saul, under divine authority.” An article in the last Quarterly, written with singular calmness and strength and with great skill and learning, takes this view of the subject, and almost made a convert of me. But I distrust the soundness of those criticisms on any given subject which require so much labor. Either the question in dispute is an exceedingly difficult one to manage, or the hand that grapples with it is overmatched in the conflict. We do not say that this is so in reference to the article in the Quarterly, for we are greatly pleased with it; but we are safe in saying that, as a general rule, this is the case. But, whatever may be the judgment formed of the correctness of the criticism to which the passage under consideration has called out, it has not reached any final conclusions in the premises.

It seems to me that the question has not been examined as yet on its true and proper merits.

It is not, we think, the proper question to be considered as to "*who* and by *what* authority has the name *Christian* been given to the disciples at Antioch?" but "*why* was it given?" These are quite different catagories, and require a different mode of argument in disposing of them. The *who*, the *what*, and the *why*, lead into quite opposite fields of inquiry, and yet they may meet at the same gateway. *Who* did a certain thing? *what* did he do? and *why* did he do it? are questions wholly unlike, and the answer to any one or two of them, does not necessarily imply the third.

We know what the disciples were called, viz: *Christians*. Let us inquire why they were so called; and if we can approximate so near to it as to satisfy the reader, then, possibly, we may find out who called them by this name; and if we shall be unable to do this, by direct testimony, we shall at least acquiesce in its propriety no matter who gave it.

There are some things occurring which we call providential. They may not be the subjects of special revelation, but such a combination of circumstances may be found that we readily admit that the hand of God was in them; as in the selling of Joseph into Egypt; the afflictions of Job; the flight of Joseph and Mary. and others of a similar kind. May not this view help us to understand why the Christian name was given to the disciples *first* at Antioch. It occurred in the year of our Lord 42, nine years after the church had been established in Jerusalem. It was after the gospel had spread through Judea and Samaria; after the conversion of Saul of Tarsus, and the Gentile house of Cornelius. The congregation at Antioch, was made up, chiefly, we suppose, of proselytes of the gate, to prepare Paul and Barnabas for preaching to the idolatrous Gentiles; and as a warrant given them in the eyes of the Jewish converts for this mission. It was not without design that the first converts from among the Gentiles, as in the case of Cornelius and family, should have been of unexceptionable character, religiously and morally; and so of the *material* of which the church at Antioch was formed. These acted as a sort of road-stead and anchorage, for the ship of zion, before it ventured into the more difficult and dangerous seas which opened before it. The well rigged vessel, now attracted all eyes, and became a matter of wonder and admiration. It was not to suffer blockade in the quiet waters in which it had landed, but was preparing for a long and distant voyage in every sea; and was receiving its freight, experienced seamen, and ample provisions for the future. The genius of the Christian religion did not admit of a sudden leap from Judea to Illyricum, much

less into the very heart of Polytheism. It approached those benighted regions through a more natural channel, leaving the flag of Bethlehem floating over all the countries of which it took possession, so that its course from Jerusalem, the mother church, could be distinctly traced by every eye. It will be remembered that the apostles, and those associated with them, after they had made converts among the Jews, the Samaritans, and the proselytes of the gate, returned to the church in Jerusalem to report what they had done; and so Paul and Barnabas were sent out by the church at Antioch, to convert the idolatrous Gentiles to the faith; and upon their return they "rehearsed all that God had done by them." Antioch became another center of missionary effort, as Jerusalem had been from the beginning. Shall I call it the mother church of the Gentiles, as Jerusalem had been of the Jews; or rather the foster mother. Antioch was admirably situated to accomplish these designs. It lay in Syria, a country thought by the Jews to occupy a sort of middle ground between the sacred land of their fathers, and the polluted soil of the Gentiles. It was neither holy nor profane, and was a fit place for the gathering together a congregation of proselytes of the gate, which would serve as a light-house, at the "land's end," for all who would sail in distant seas. It was full of Jews, and of proselytes from among the Gentiles, who were always numerous where there were many Jews. Some of the Gentiles became favorable to the Jews' religion, who did not join the synagogue. The first converts in Antioch were made by the men of Cyprus and Cyrene, disciples who were dispersed at the first persecution that ensued upon Stephen's martyrdom, and are called Grecians—rather Gentiles, reading *Ellanas* and not *Ellanistas*. That they were devout Gentiles, and not Jews, is evident from the fact that they are said "to have turned to the Lord," they having turned to God already.

Now, it was in this city, that "the disciples were first called Christians, and it had a meaning there, which it would not have had elsewhere in the past history of the church. It was a new era—a grand epoch, which would have an important bearing on its future progress to the end of time. It was the first decided step in the creation of one new man, composed of Jews and Gentiles; and of breaking down the middle wall of partition between them. It was the reconciling both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity in himself. The far off and the nigh, were now brought together into one loving fraternity. The Gentiles were no longer strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God. It was fitting that this new family, new community—*new man*, should

have a *new* name. The old names, such as disciples, scholars, believers, church or assembly, would not answer so well; and those which were given them by their enemies—Nazarenes, Galileans, the men of this way, or sect, would not answer at all; and therefore a name, generic and all comprehensive, was now created and adopted, suitable to them, both warranted by the grace and the providence of God. The church at Antioch was a new thing, and needed a new name. Indeed, this is the true philosophy of all names. Things always exist before their appropriate names. The words, or the roots of words, may have a prior existence, but they are never given until the things or persons have a positive existence, which demand them. Thus we have the Episcopal church, the Baptist, the Presbyterian, the Methodist, the Swedenborgian churches. Before the existence of these organizations, these names were unappropriated, although in some measure they were known. The child must be born before it can be properly named.

It will be observed, that God has often pursued the same course in reference to other matters in which the same principle is involved. A few illustrations we will offer. The original name given to the father of the faithful was Abram, but when God by covenant made him—"a father of many nations," he said, "Thy name shall not be called any more Abram—but thy name shall be *Abraham*, for a father of many nations have I made thee." Now, there is but little difference in these two names; only the addition of a consonant and the dropping of a vowel, which were designed to give intensity and fullness to the meaning of the latter. So Jacob, was changed into Israel. Here the dissimilarity is more striking—"Thy name shall be called no more Jacob but Israel; for as a prince hast thou power with God and with men and hast prevailed." The change of these names originated in the necessity of things. They were adapted to the new phases of their character and state, and fully expressed what these *new men* now were. Before the events which gave birth to these names existed, they would have been inappropriate, but all can see how suitable they now are. The proper name of the harbinger of Jesus was John, but when he began to immerse, he was called John the Immerser, having received the appellation from the action. Many instances of this kind may be given, but these will suffice. These, then, embody some of the reasons *why* the disciples were *first* called Christians at Antioch.

But there are other reasons, good and substantial, besides these, and independent of all that may be said upon *Autous*, the subject of *Chramatisai*, and the criticism which these words have elicited. These may be taken into the account, but they are designed to

settle the question, *who* gave the name, rather than *why* was it given. It must be admitted, that if the latter is not the most important for us to know, it is the very one assigned in the Scriptures for the changes of Abram into Abraham—of Jacob into Israel, and of John, into the Immerser. The question is not *who* gave these names, but *why* were they given? This seems to be in accordance with the *usus loquendi* of Scripture, and may well govern us in the subject we are now considering.

Before the day of Pentacost, we have the name Jesus, the Messiah, the Son of God, the Prophet, the Nazarene, the Son of Man, &c., but after the coronation and the commencement of his reign, his regal name is adopted. He is now the anointed Lord, the Lord Jesus Christ, Lord of all, Lord of the dead and the living, Lord from Heaven, Lord of the church, one Lord, Lord of Lords, Jesus is the Lord. The name Lord he had before the commencement of his kingdom, but not as the anointed Lord. He was "constituted both Lord and Christ" in the holiest of all. Henceforth, this was to be his regal—his highest official name, which is above every name.

Jesus was Lord of all when he was anointed in the Heaven of Heavens, after his ascension, but until the church at Antioch was formed, it was not fully manifested upon earth. His body—the church at Antioch—is now in its infancy, historically considered. The twain are now made one, and forever are to be so regarded; and as Antioch was the place chosen for this, it was altogether proper that the *anointed* name should descend upon the new body. The full intent of his anointing had begun, now, to be realized; and for the same reason that Jesus was called the anointed Lord, the grand *ideal* of his Lordship, must be signified, and hence the name Christian.

The men of Cyprus and Cyrene, when "they came to Antioch preached the Lord Jesus, and the hand of the Lord was with them, and a great number believed and turned to the Lord."

The Lordship of Jesus over angels and men, seems to have been the chief subject upon which these missionaries spoke; and this was accompanied with special signs and wonders from his "hand;" and the consequence was that many of the people "turned to the Lord." Tidings of these things came to the ears of the church in Jerusalem, and they sent forth Barnabas to go to Antioch, doubtless to inquire into the matter, and see what these things meant, and to ascertain the truth of the report, which had reached them. "And when he came and had seen the grace of God, he was glad, and exhorted them *all*, that with purpose of heart, they would cleave unto the Lord." And such was the interest he felt in the cause at Antioch, "that he departed to Tar-

sus, to seek Saul, and having found him, he brought him to Antioch, and a whole year they assembled with the church and taught much people, and the disciples were called Christians first at Antioch."

"*And in those days* came prophets from Jerusalem unto Antioch." Among these prophets there was one named Agabus, "who signified by the Spirit that there should be a great dearth throughout all the world: which came to pass in the days of Claudius Cesar. Then the disciples, every man according to his ability, determined to send relief unto the brethren which dwelt in Judea: which also they did, and sent it to the Elders by the hands of Barnabas and Saul." Now, from this short history of the church at Antioch, a few things we will gather to show the reader how worthy the disciples there, were of having the name Christian; and this may not be the least of the reasons why the name was given to them.

1st. They cheerfully and readily received the word as preached by the men of Cyprus and Cyrene, and "turned to the Lord"—a great number of them became the disciples of Christ. This was most pleasing to the Lord and his servants.

2d. The church in Jerusalem heard of it and sent a man "full of the Holy Spirit and of faith," to see and ascertain the facts in the case. He was "glad" when he came and witnessed the divine effects of the gospel over those who believed. It surpassed all his expectations, and filled him with unutterable joy.

3d. The visit and labors of this servant of the Lord, Barnabas, were attended with similar effects with those of Cyprus and Cyrene—"much people, a great multitude, were added to the Lord."

4th. The field was so fruitful, and the demand for labor so great, that Barnabas went in search of Saul, and brought him to Antioch, where they tarried for the space of one year, and "taught much people," or a great multitude.

5th. Prophets from Jerusalem came to Antioch, and one of them, Agabus by name, predicted that a great famine would come upon all the world, which took place in the days of Claudius Cesar. The disciples at Antioch, who had been so mindful of the words of the men of Cyprus and Cyrene; of the exhortations of Barnabas to cleave to the Lord with full purpose of heart, and of the teachings of Saul and Barnabas, now gave full credit to the predictions of Agabus, and adding to their faith in Christ, and submission to his regal authority, the benevolence which characterized their Lord, they made provision beforehand for the poor saints in Judea, and gave such evidences of their being "the one body" that the very name of their Head they inherited, and by right claimed

Thus they were called Christians because they were like Christ. They had his spirit. They possessed his benevolence. They had fairly won the pre-eminent distinction of being called by his name.

To suppose that the enemies of Christ gave them this name is simply ridiculous, as no higher compliment could have been given than to have bestowed this name upon them. They had called the disciples—Nazarenes, Galileans, men of this way, or sect, but never had they called them Christians; and if the enemies of the disciples did not give the name who did? I will not answer this question, as it already has been answered by others; but I think that I have shown *why* they were called Christians, and this is all I aimed at.

In conclusion, I think that there is a moral in all of this for us and for others. Persons and things usually get the names to which they are entitled. By a law of compensation the different religious parties wear certain names which appropriately belong to them. They have earned and should have them. A certain sect, in departing from the original divine institution, aspired to the Episcopate, and they got it; hence Episcopalians. Another was captivated by the Presbyter, and they wear the name of Presbyterians. Another was fond of method, and they gained the name of Methodism; and so another of baptism, and they received the name of Baptist.

It is worthy of remark, that the latter name is as near the right one, as the Baptist was to the Christ. It is a sort of harbinger—a voice in the wilderness. May not this have been for the reason that they were nearer right than the other parties, to which we have referred? I well remember an argument offered by a certain dignitary in the Elkhorn Association, why he would not accept the name of Christian, and part from that of Baptist. A resolution had been offered in that grave assembly, by Dr. Fishback, to the effect, that the churches represented in it, should lay aside the name of Baptist, and adopt that of Christian. It met with bitter opposition, and was lost. And the chief argument against it, was that which was offered by the person to whom I refer, who said: "I know that I am a Baptist, but I do not know that I am a Christian." This was candid, and ingenious if not ingenuous. There was more in it than, perhaps, he intended. But who does not see in this an undesigned compliment in the name Christian? If he, and those associated with him, had been worthy of the name, it would have been given them, and they would meekly have received it.

There is a providence in all this. The hand of God may be seen visibly in it. By a strange fatality, the apostasy, and those

who in any wise partake of it, get the blessing of Esau. They have sold their birth-right for a mess of pottage, and have become Edomites, and their leaders Dukes of Edom, or Doctors of divinity. But they have no inheritance in Israel.

And there is a lesson here for us, and we must not fail to receive it. We have attempted to restore the apostolic gospel, and ancient order of things. In this we have done well, and our work will remain. We have adopted the names given to the followers of Christ, as found in the New Testament, and wisely we think, selected the name disciple or scholar in the beginning, just as they did from Jerusalem to Antioch. Have we fairly won the name Christian, historically? This is a grave question, and I mean it as such. I do not ask if our enemies have given it to us. We know that they have not. Nor do I ask if Barnabas and Saul, have, by revelation, given it to us? But having received the name, are we worthy of wearing it? Have we the singleness of heart and purpose; the spirit and temper; the benevolence and missionary enterprise; have we the likeness of Christ, which characterized the disciples at Antioch? if so, Christian is our true patronymic; and if we suffer as Christians, let us not be ashamed, but rather glorify God on this account. But if the name is falsely or wantonly worn, it will be; not only a reproach to us, but a desecration of it. Whatever may have been our past history, and it may well compare with the best of those who deny us the name of Christian, we should not be satisfied with our present attainments, but reach forward to higher standards of purity and piety. No limits should be put to our attainments in the Christian life. A Presbyterian, or a Methodist, can never get beyond his sect, *without leaving it*—as indeed many have done; and just so far as they became scholars of the New Testament, they approximate to the ground we occupy, and by this means they leave the old and dry skin of a former life, behind them, and into which they never can return. But we have nothing to do but “to go forward;” to follow our leader, and to be more and more assimilated to him.

The writer of this, has been associated with the disciples from the beginning. He knows their history, understands their principles and designs, and has partaken of their reproach and persecution, the neglect and scorn, to which they have been subjected; and he has counted it “greater riches than the treasures of Egypt.” But he is not satisfied with himself, nor with his brethren. He would fain live to see the ideal of Christians fully realized among us. He feels in some measure the inspiration of this name, and the call it makes for a life of faith, and of heroic devotion; of self-denial, and of patient suffering; of un-

affected humility, and earnest zeal; of crucifixion to the world, and a resurrection to a new and laborious life in Christ; of full purpose of heart in cleaving to the Lord, and counting all things but loss that he may gain Christ. To wear this name, and to be worthy of it, is the highest honor and privilege to which we can aspire. The martyrs of the church, when they were offered release from the prison and the rack, if they would cast a grain of incense upon the altars of idolatry, said, and it was enough for them to say: "I am a Christian." Do we thus feel and act, when tempted by the world, the flesh, and the devil, to say or do anything contrary to the name of Christ?

O, this name Christian, is a trumpet peal to battle. It summons me to high and manly deeds; to noble and heroic endeavors; it speaks of Calvary and the cross; it tells of battles fought and won; of prisons, racks, and pillories; of tears, and cries, and tortures; of hopes, and joys, and triumphs; it comes to us from Syria, and from all the countries swept by the Mediterranean, from Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia. It is the word familiar to the ears of all who lived under the Cæsars. It is a name redolent with all that is good and Godlike, and Christlike, since the days of our risen and exalted Lord. It is as a garden which God has blessed. It is a name taken from that dear blessed name, which is like ointment poured forth, and which by its fragrance fills the temple. All his garments smell of myrrh, and aloes, and cassia, out of the ivory palaces. May the odor of his name make us "glad," and gladden the world around us!

The movement which we have inaugurated, is a public protest against the party creeds, and denominationalisms of the day, and it is felt everywhere. As it was undertaken in honor of our Lord and Christ, he has done more for us than we asked or thought. Many saw the evil abroad, but they resigned themselves to it, and thought that they could do nothing. Some, made an ineffectual effort to stay the flood of corruption, but were swept away by it. Thousands, now, in all the parties, know that we are right, and approve our course, but have not the courage to unite with us. This is particularly so, in regard to their preachers; but they have much to lose in position and pelf, and this keeps them in prison bounds. They are ill at ease. All honor to the men who saw the need for reformation, and took their stand by the side of the apostles, and have borne a portion of their trials and afflictions! They have done a mighty work, and have not turned to the right or left, but have gone straight forward in their unbeaten path. They found it rough and flinty, but have left it comparatively smooth. Let no adventurous feet, lead any por-

tion of the flock astray! These scar-worn veterans have been single-eyed, and still are jealous of the truth. Whilst they look with exultation and joy, back, upon the work they have done, and the way they did it, they gladly bequeath the inheritance to the younger branches of the family, and say, "take care of it—keep it without loss until the appearing and kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ." Hold fast that which you have received not from us, but from the apostles. No creeds—but the New Testament. No name or names, but such as are found therein. No gospel, but such as was preached by Peter and Paul. No worship, but such as was known in the first churches. No government, but such as was known in "the beginning." And no plea for union or communion, but such as Christ and his apostles approve.

If we have been "a peculiar people," in the sense of *singular*, it has been owing to the fact that we have lived among a strange—rather, an estranged people, from the "old paths." Let our peculiarity hereafter be seen, in our "zeal for good works." Many of our churches are broken up or widely scattered—send them help. The ravages of war are widely and disastrously felt among us. And as the famine in the days of Claudius Cesar, was anticipated and provided for by the Christian congregation at Antioch—let us be equally emulous to help our brethren, in the no less evils which have befallen them in the scourge of war.

OMICRON.

OMICRON'S ARTICLE. Whether Omicron has or has not succeeded in detecting and assigning the true reason for calling the disciples Christians first in Antioch, is a question which we shall assume our readers perfectly competent to decide for themselves. We still, however, beg leave respectfully to think that the question, who gave the name? which also involves the question, by what authority was it given? is incomparably the more important of the two. Moreover, this question we think fully susceptible of being decided even by "verbal criticism;" and that, too, to a degree of certainty entitled to so much confidence that even the cautious Omicron need not distrust it. The closing paragraphs of the article command our highest respect. They are the paternal admonitions of an ancient and true man in Israel—ripe utterances of one whose heart is set on the truth, and who has long toiled for its triumph.

WILL-WORSHIP.

In vain do you worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.—
Jesus the Messiah.

THE world has been very slow to apprehend the true nature of Christianity. The second Millennium since the introduction of the gospel, is rapidly drawing to a close, and a large majority of the professors of religion, even, have not yet advanced beyond the mere vestibule of the great temple of truth. Very few, indeed, seem to aspire to enter its sacred penetralia, where souls that hunger and thirst for knowledge, are permitted to feast upon “the deep things of God.”

The fundamental thought in the true religion, is the subordination of the human will to the will of God. I do not mean a dreamy, sentimental, half-hypochondriac resignation to what may be called the dispensations of Providence, but rather a healthy, vigorous, self-control, a mastery of all the appetites, passions, and impulsions of our being, the bringing of every volition, and every action into conformity with the divine will, as expressed in the divine commandments. This idea of the subordination of the human will to the will of God, is that, in which, consists the very essence of true piety. It belongs to all dispensations alike. For while a change of dispensation brings with it a change of law, the principles which underlie the law, never change. God is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever. He changes not. The *principles* of the divine government, therefore, never change. This “principle” is the very foundation stone upon which that government rests. Nay, without it, there could be no such thing as a divine government at all. The universe would fall at once into utter chaos.

What is will-worship? Is it true, or false worship? In what does it consist? Let me quote from the New Testament, the only passage in which it is found: “Which things have indeed a show of wisdom in will-worship, and humility, and neglecting of the body; not in any honor to the satisfying of the flesh.” Col. ii: 23. This is a very obscure verse. Indeed, as I quote it here from the common version, I should pronounce it, as a whole, decidedly unintelligible. And yet, even from this, it is easy to perceive, that will-worship is utterly valueless. I will now quote the passage at length, as translated by Conybeare. (*Life and Epistles*, Vol. 2, page 390.) “If then, when you died with Christ, you put away the childish lessons of outward things, why, as though you still lived in outward things, do you submit yourselves to decrees (hold not,

taste not, touch not—forbidding the use of things which are all made to be consumed in the using) founded on the precepts and doctrines of men? For these precepts, though they have a show of wisdom, in a self-chosen worship, and in humiliation, and chastening of the body, are of no value to check the indulgence of fleshly passions.”

Without stopping to say much that might, perhaps, be profitably said, in connection with this passage, it is sufficient for my present purpose, to call the reader's attention to a fact that lies upon its very surface, namely, that will-worship and true worship, are the two opposing points of an antithesis; that they stand over against each other in direct and palpable antagonism. In true worship, God chooses for us what we shall do; in false worship, we follow our own choice. The former is “founded” upon the will and commandments of God; the latter, upon “the commandments and doctrines of men.” This is the grand, fundamental distinction between all that is true, and all that is false, in religion. The spurious worship to which the apostle here alludes, is, by him expressly styled “a self-chosen worship.” It has no power to check the indulgence of fleshly passions. It can help no man onward in the struggle for eternal life. It does not even burnish the weapons with which he fights the battles of the great King. But as it can do him no good, it must do positive harm. It leads him away from God, away from the truth, and induces him to trust in the traditions and philosophies of men, while he wastes his strength, and his life, in keeping “the commandments of men.”

But I desire to make this distinction between the true and false in religion, as plain as possible. God is the moral governor of the universe. All men and angels are under law to him. Loyalty to the divine government, requires a hearty obedience to divine law. Whatever God commands, therefore, we must do. To hesitate, to falter, is to forsake our allegiance. To set up any “commandment of men,” and honor it as a command of God, is treason. God's will is expressed in his commandments. Every commandment, even the least, is an expression of his will, and an embodiment of his authority as the monarch of the universe. To obey his commandment, to do his will, is, therefore, the very essence of true piety. Everything else is mere will-worship. It is self-chosen; and for this single reason is a departure from our allegiance to God. However plausible and specious such worship may appear, however much of the show of wisdom it may exhibit, the Holy Spirit has written its folly and emptiness so plainly, that none but the willfully blind can fail to see.

Passages in the word of God, establishing what I have here

written, beyond a doubt, will at once occur to the mind of the thoughtful reader. "Not every one that says to me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that does the will of my Father who is in heaven." There is a volume in this single declaration. Not loud professions, not sanctimonious countenances, not clappings and shoutings, not zeal, however earnest and devout, in the observance of a self-chosen, and self-imposed ritual, will admit men either into the kingdom of heaven here, or into heaven itself, hereafter. The condition is a very simple one indeed; but with all the temptations of the Devil, with all the blandishments of the world, with all the weaknesses of the flesh, who shall say it is not a difficult one? Still it is simple—exceedingly simple. It is only to do the *will* of God; to keep *his* commandments. Let the words of the Saviour be written on every heart—"He that does the *will* of my Father who is in heaven."

Take the text which stands as the motto of this article: "In vain do you worship me teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." Here the Saviour makes a bold thrust at the hypocrisy and will-worship of his cotemporaries. The religion of the Jews, in those days, was an apostasy from the religion given them by Moses. They were overburdened with the traditions and commandments of men. Their worship was, emphatically, "a self-chosen worship, founded upon the precepts and doctrines of men." The Lord Jesus tells them plainly, that while these self-imposed observances were an insult to *him*, they were utterly vain as regarded *themselves*. True religion then, as now, consisted, not in following human traditions, and obeying uninspired human precepts, but, in doing from the heart the will of God as written in his own holy commandments.

When God, through Moses, instructed the Children of Israel how they should worship him, he expressly forbade them to inquire into the human ceremonials of the idolatrous nations, that he had cast out before them. They were not to do to the Lord their God as these foolish heathen had done to their false gods. The law was very plain. "What thing soever I command you, observe to do it; you shall neither add thereto, nor diminish from it." The principle which underlies this law has never changed. The Israelites were to do the very thing that God commanded. They were neither to add to it, nor to diminish from it. This holds good yet. Every super-addition to, or subtraction from the divine commandments, is a daring and presumptuous attempt to infringe upon the prerogative of Jehovah. This is what renders will-worship so odious in the sight of God. It is contempt for his authority. It is rebellion against his government. Whatever thing God commands us to do, that very thing we must do.

We have no election in the matter. We must do the very thing commanded, or incur the displeasure of Jehovah. No human substitute will do. The law is plain, and from it there is no appeal. "Whatsoever thing I command you, observe to do it; you shall neither add thereto, nor diminish from it."

When Saul went out to battle against the Amalekites, he had special instructions from the Lord. "Now go and smite Amalek, and utterly destroy all that they have, and spare them not; but slay both man and woman, infant and suckling, oxen and sheep, camel and ass." With this commission he went out and smote the Amalekites from "Havilah to Shur, that is over against Egypt." He took Agag the King, and destroyed his entire people. But he forgot the commandment of Jehovah, and saved Agag alive; also the best of the sheep and the oxen, and of the fatlings, and the lambs. "Then came the word of the Lord to Samuel saying, 'It repenteth me that I have set up Saul to be king, for he is turned back from following me, and hath not performed my commandment.'" But Saul insisted to Samuel that he had performed the commandment of the Lord. "Yea," said he "I have obeyed the voice of the Lord, and have gone the way which the Lord sent me, and have brought Agag the king of Amalek, and have utterly destroyed the Amalekites; but the people took of the spoil, sheep and oxen, to offer to the Lord in Gilgal." "Oh, yes!" says Saul apparently in good faith, and without the slightest suspicion that he had done more than vary just a little, very slightly, and that in mere circumstantialia, from the instructions he had received, "oh, yes! I have obeyed the voice of the Lord, and have gone the way which the Lord sent me." But what said the Lord to him? "Behold to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams. For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry. Because thou hast rejected the word of the Lord, he also hath rejected thee from being king." Here we learn, that to vary from a divine commandment, even in its most unimportant circumstantialia, is rebellion against Jehovah. When will men cease to stumble at the commandments of God? Alas! that Saul's case should be the type of so many cases in Christendom, to-day! How many proud Pharisees, who curl their lips in scorn, when even the name of my brethren is mentioned, are destined yet to learn, that to obey God is better than sanctimonious cant, better than boastings of orthodoxy, better than all the visionary experiences born of the dreamy and superstitious teachings of apostate sects!

But the oldest case of will-worship on record is the case of Cain. Perhaps also, whether we consider the circumstances under which

it occurred, or the unhappy tragedy that grew out of it, it deserves to be classed among the most inexcusable. God had commanded the shedding of blood. In this there is no mistake. For though we are not told, in the book of Genesis, in so many words, that such was the case, yet the fact is deducible by a logical process, that admits of no doubt whatever.

1st. God had either given to men, instructions in regard to what worship would be acceptable to him, or he had not. He had either given them a commandment to be governed by, or he had not. Say, if you please, that he had given them no instructions on the subject. If this were so, then the whole transaction was an unauthorized procedure on the part of both Cain and Abel. If they were left to follow their own views of the fitness of things, then there could have been no crime in being mistaken, and Cain, even if his offering had not been accepted, would not have been adjudged a sinner. Besides, if God had given no commandment—expressed no choice—then any form of worship they might have adopted, would have been a “self-chosen worship,” and according to the teaching of the Holy Spirit by Paul, would have been utterly useless. In this case, Abel’s sacrifice of blood would have been no better than the offering of Cain.

2d. But Paul tells us (Heb. xi : 4), *by faith*, Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain. Now, it is very clear, that if God had given no commandment, neither Cain nor Abel could have acted “by faith.” For in the absence of any revelation from God, faith is simply impossible. Where there is no divine command, there can be no such thing as the obedience of faith. If there be any one who has yet to learn these things, with him, I will not now attempt to reason. Because Abel is said to have made his offering in faith, we know, therefore, that God had given a command, and that Abel did the very thing which he was required to do.

But the entire institution of sacrifice is so manifestly supernatural, that to argue the question of its divine origin, would seem a waste of time. No process of reasoning ever could have led to it. There is no apparent connection between the thing done and the proposed end, so that no human philosophy ever could have suggested it. Indeed, considered from a mere human stand-point, the whole institution must have appeared not only unmeaning, but, supremely foolish. Yet, it has a rationale, a most touching and impressive one. But to see it, you must scale the heights of Calvary, and stand by the side of the dying Saviour. You must listen to the exclamation—“My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me,” as the words come bursting from his noble heart in that sad hour of agony. You must hear that

tender, apologetic prayer for his enemies and murderers. You must draw very near, and see the precious blood, as it trickles from his thorn-pierced temples, and courses its way along the lines of his divinely benevolent face. You must watch the rugged soldier as he pierces his side with the pitiless spear, and look at the crimson tide that gushes forth, when it is withdrawn. You must hear him say, "It is finished," and gaze upon his heavenly countenance, as he calmly breathes out his life, an offering for the sins of the world. From this bloody, but glorious eminence, and with these surroundings, you may look back over the four thousand years of human folly and crime, that had gone by, and see the meaning of all the sacrificial blood that has ever been shed. But for this scene, present in the mind of God from the beginning, present before the first altar was reared, or the blood of the first victim shed, the institution of sacrifice had never been. But for this, and without a divine commandment, had it been possible to conceive the thought, and to embody it in an institution, still the whole thing would have been an unprofitable and senseless farce.

We are forced, therefore, to the conclusion, that in the very infancy of the world, when our race was yet in a single family, God made a revelation, that has not, in words, come down to us. In that revelation, was the institution of sacrifice. Here he commanded the shedding of blood for the remission of sins; and may be, gave some kind of intimation of the great event the institution was intended to foreshadow. At least, we know that he ordained sacrifice, and that the shedding of blood was in the command, for such was the offering of Abel, and he made it "by faith; that is, according to the divine appointment.

But what shall I say of Cain? He was the first born of a fallen, yet noble pair. The mother of all living had not only hailed his birth with joy, but had watched over his infancy and childhood, with all a mother's tenderness and solicitude. She had labored hard—who can doubt it? to mould his heart to noble and lofty purposes. Her nursery stories had been glowing and eloquent recitals of her own happy experiences in the garden of delights, or thrilling and rapturous descriptions of the beauty and magnificence of her once happy home. Often, no doubt, with a heart chastened and subdued by suffering, she spoke of her own sad mistake, and fearful fall; not in words of complaint, or murmuring, against the kind Creator, whose sentence, she felt in her very heart, had in it more of mercy than wrath; but rather, in warning and admonition to her beloved boy. His noble father did not neglect the training of his first-born son. He was the pride and joy of that father's existence. With earnest words, he sought to direct his young heart to the highest and noblest ends of

human life. With intense solicitude, as in view of his own sad remembrances, he strove to lift his soul to God, as the Father of mercies, and Fountain of all good, and to impress upon his yet susceptible heart, the importance of the most scrupulous fidelity to him, in all his holy appointments. Thus nurtured, thus trained, Cain should have been a noble specimen of our race. But, alas, for human frailty! Alas! that so dark a page should record the history of one so nurtured, so idolized, by the noblest human pair that ever yet graced our earth!

God had said, "Let the altar be reared, let the blood of the victim be spilled, and let it be offered up as an atonement for sin." But Cain was a tiller of the earth. His wealth consisted not in flocks and herds, but rather, in the direct produce of the soil. It was neither so cheap, nor so convenient, for him to offer a lamb in sacrifice to God. His heart began to rebel. His imagination went eagerly to work. Why so particular about a mere form? If the heart is right, then surely, God will be satisfied. The salvation of the soul cannot depend upon an outward act. As Cain, probably reasoned then, so we know that many most foolishly—not to say wickedly—reason now. Strange, that men who make everything depend upon the state of the heart, should, in the very logic by which they attempt to sustain themselves, give evidence of the rebellion of their own hearts against the wisdom, and the will of Jehovah. But so it is now, and the circumstances indicate, that so it may have been then. He set his wits to work to fix upon a plausible substitute for the divine appointment. The historian tells us what the result of his cogitations on this subject was. His expedient was a very specious, and under the circumstances, a very natural one. I venture to assert, that, rarely, has an unauthorized human substitute, been more like the divine appointment it was intended to replace, than was Cain's. "And in-process of time, it came to pass, that Cain brought of the fruits of the ground, an offering to the Lord." How very natural, if he must depart from the divine commandment at all, that he should have departed just as he did! It cannot be that God is so punctilious as to require exactness in mere circumstantialia. The spirit of the institution is, that something shall be "devoted" to God. It is eminently proper that this should be done. Since the Creator sends the gentle shower, distills the pearly dew, and sheds down his golden sunshine, thus making our toilings effectual in bringing forth from the bosom of mother, earth, the copious harvest, it is but fit, that a portion of what, by his blessing we enjoy, should be given up, dedicated as an offering to him. The mere *material* of the offering can make no difference. The "mode" of the thing is altogether unimportant. The heart is everything; the

state of the heart, is that which makes an offering acceptable; and my heart being right, my offering, though not in the precise form indicated, will, no doubt, be acceptable to him. We do not know positively, that Cain reasoned thus, for the historian does not tell us what his reasonings were. We do know however, that men, who behave as Cain did, men who ought to know and to do better, reason thus, or similarly, now. Was not Cain the father of the doctrine of non-essentialism? Was he not the first to replace a divine institution by an unauthorized expedient of his own? And does not God regard the will-worship of this age, just as he did the insult he received at the hands of Cain? Most assuredly he does. Cain's wicked departure from the divine commandment, led him to get into a strife with his brother, which terminated in his murdering him. In like manner, the doctrines and commandments of men have been the fruitful source of strife and discord among brethren ever since. Not without meaning, said the Messiah, "In vain do you worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men."

Gentle reader, before the bar of your understanding and conscience, I arraign the sects and parties of our time, upon the charge of will-worship. Will you hear my pleadings? Will you hear me patiently, and without prejudice? You shall try the cause. For the present, I rest everything upon your decision. I only ask that you shall have a single eye, an honest heart, and that you shall make up your verdict as one who shall, himself, give account to God. My specifications shall not be numerous, but I promise you, they shall be to the point.

Specification 1. Infant sprinkling. What I say under this head, will, of course, apply only to those who practice it; and the same may be said of any other item to which I shall hereafter call your attention. You remember all that has been said, as to what will-worship is, and the distinction between that and the true worship? Let this distinction be written upon your very soul, while you are reading this brief, but earnest plea, and I fear not the result.

First, then, is there anything in the Bible, to warrant the belief that God wills the existence of this rite? Is there any divine command requiring it? But I need hardly have asked this latter question, for it will scarcely be pretended, that there is any such precept. Our opponents have so often been asked for the chapter and verse, in which it is written, "Let the infant be baptized," that it would seem like adding insult to injury, to annoy them with such questions any more. The time has come, when every sensible man, that still clings to this relic of the great apostasy, should have the candor to say with the learned and ingenuous

Neander, "It is certain that Christ did not ordain infant baptism." The corner-stone of the present reformation was laid in a plea for the union of Christians, written near the beginning of this century, by Thomas Campbell, in these words: "Nothing, for which, there is not express precept, or approved precedent, in the word of God, should be considered essential to salvation, or be made a test of fellowship among Christians." These words fastened themselves in the heart of one, who, since then, has won laurels in the development of the great truth embodied in them, that will flourish to eternity. He turned them over and over in his mind, looking at them from every conceivable position, until his soul became absorbed in the grand idea contained in them. And though he was not, at first, able to grasp in his understanding, the mighty results which were to follow the deposit of this great seed-truth in the hearts of the faithful few then prepared for its reception, yet, he saw enough to kindle the fire of a noble enthusiasm in his heart, and to rouse all the energies of his soul into the most intense activity. This reformation is the development of a single conception, and that conception is embodied in, and suggested by these words. All honor, under God, to the noble intellect, and deeply pious heart, that guided the pen, which first wrote them. But I am wandering. These words very soon became the theme of animated discussion in the religious circles of that day. On one of those occasions, in company where grave and reverend theologians were present, attention was called to them. "Those words," said a distinguished Presbyterian rabbi, "are specious, but not sound. Follow them to their legitimate result, and you must become a Baptist." "What," interposed one, "Is there, then, neither precept, nor precedent, for infant baptism?" The reply was—"Not one." This incident put in motion a ball that has been rolling ever since. But is it true, that infant sprinkling is without precept or precedent in the word of God? Most unquestionably it is. It is certain that Christ did not ordain infant baptism. But it may be said that I am too fast, that I am assuming the point to be proved, or making too much of concessions not generally agreed to. Very well; let us proceed slowly, and cautiously. Let me ask once more, then, is there a direct precept in the Bible, authorizing, or requiring infant baptism? No one pretends that there is. I then put the question: Is there any clear, unquestionable precedent? Is there any case reported in Holy Writ, wherein it is said, that infants were baptized? There can be but one answer—there is no such case. But unless there be precept or precedent for it, then it is will-worship. No amount of ingenuity can evade this conclusion. Our infant-sprinkling friends, seem to imagine, however, some of them, at

least, that in a certain sense, they have both precept and precedent. And, yet, the questions asked above, will not, nay, cannot be answered otherwise than as I have answered them. How, then, is the case made out? The answer is, by logical deduction; by "good and necessary inference." Let us, therefore, for awhile, turn our attention in this direction. But first, let me here, in the name of my brethren, and in behalf of the truth, enter a most solemn protest against the attempt to find a divine warrant for a religious ceremonial, practiced "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit," in any such way. What one does in these sacred names, ought to be proved beyond the possibility of a doubt. I can conceive of few things more fearful than the position of a man practicing the unsanctified ceremonials of a mere human tradition in these awful and revered names. But every time that water is sprinkled upon an unconscious babe, the administrator, by direct and formal invocation, gives God as authority for what he does, when if his salvation depended on making good his words, he dare not say that he has either a positive divine command, or a clear unquestionable precedent in the whole Bible to sustain him. Alas, for a cause that stands upon such a tottering and rickety foundation as this!

But it is time to come to the argument, in which this divine warrant, equivalent to a command, is supposed to be found. I shall state it as follows: God has had a church on earth since the days of Abraham. It has existed under different dispensations, but has been all the time one and the same church. Formerly, infants were admitted into it by circumcision. Under the Christian dispensation, baptism has taken the place of circumcision, and, therefore, as infants were formerly circumcised, they should now be baptized.

In examining this argument, I shall insist upon it, that to have the force of a divine command, there must not be the slightest uncertainty attaching to any material part of it. Unless this is the case, you can not possibly know whether your inference is certainly true or not; and surely no man in his senses, who has any respect for himself, or fear of God before his eyes, would venture to practice in the name of Heaven, what he knows to be of doubtful authority. If, therefore, it be considered material to the argument, that baptism comes in the room of circumcision, I then ask, is it absolutely certain that such is the case? Is this so beyond mistake? In what particular chapter and verse, is it said to be so? Nay, is it not true, rather, that the proposition is mere unsupported assumption? Are there not insuperable objections to be urged against it? When these and similar questions shall have been answered, then, there is not an honest man on earth

who could say that he felt perfectly sure of the position in question. Was circumcision the "door" into the Jewish church? Then must one half the nation, and that, no doubt, very decidedly the better half, have been forever debarred from its privileges. Surely the Mohammedan superstition, that women have no souls, was not a doctrine of the Abrahamic covenant! But my object is not, now, to suggest difficulties, nor offer objections. It is not true, clearly it is not, even without an objection, that there is no doubt as to any material part of this argument. And I insist upon it, that, if a man attempt to sustain a religious practice by "necessary inference," there shall be no uncertainty about his premises. But perhaps it may be urged, that it is not essential to the validity of this argument, to prove that baptism comes in the room of circumcision. It may be said, that the question of identity covers the whole ground; that God has never had but one church on earth; that the dispensation has changed, but the church did not lose its identity; that infants were members of this church formerly, and, therefore, ought to be members now. To this argument, as now presented; I reply, first, that even if it could be proved, that the Jewish Theocracy and the church of Christ are identical in a very few leading generalities—and no sensible man will honestly pretend to more—still the premises would not warrant the conclusion sought to be deduced from them. For whatever may be said about identity in general features, if the term church may properly be applied to the old institution at all, it is certain, that in the change of dispensation, important changes were made not only in the statutes and regulations governing it, but in the very structure of the organization itself. Thus it is evident, that, if we concede everything a reasonable opponent would venture to claim, the argument is yet, manifestly defective. No intelligent man can justify himself at the bar of his own conscience, much less at the bar of God, for practicing, upon any such uncertain warrant, a religious ceremonial, in the most sacred names in the universe.

But this idea of a church of Christ in the family of Abraham, or under the Jewish dispensation, is itself a baseless assumption. The supposed identity of the Jewish institution with the kingdom of Heaven under the reign of Jesus Christ, is a mere figment of the imagination, not only unsupported by, but clearly contrary to, the most palpable facts. It is true, in a certain sense, that the Jews enjoyed the kingdom of God; but between that kingdom and the one established by Jesus Christ, there are fundamental and constitutional differences, utterly subversive of this whole theory of identity. Let me take the pains, very briefly to point out some of them.

1st. As regards the reigning monarch. The Jewish government, as has been said, was a Theocracy. God himself was the head of that government. He gave laws, civil and religious, for the government of the people. He took them into covenant with himself, and by the terms of that covenant, became their king. On the other hand, the kingdom of heaven as it now exists, is a Christocracy. Jesus Christ is the reigning monarch in this kingdom. All power in heaven, and on earth, is now in his hands. His Father placed the crown upon his head, saying as he did so, "Thy throne endures forever and ever." "Reign until all enemies are put under your feet." This difference is fundamental. It is constitutional. Let no man talk of the identity of any two institutions, human or divine, with such a difference as this lying at their very foundation.

2d. The Jewish kingdom was political, as well as religious. God gave to them their entire civil code, as well as their religious institutions and ceremonials. He was their head, nationally, politically, as well as religiously. Under that dispensation, religion and politics were blended. These statements will not be called in question. But the kingdom of Jesus Christ, "is not of this world." There is no political element in it. A man may be a liege subject of King Jesus, and at the same time, fulfill faithfully all the obligations of political allegiance, under any government whose subject he may happen to have been born. "My kingdom is not of this world," is a great truth, which has yet to be thundered in the ears of men with an earnestness and power, of which the past history of the church knows nothing. Here, then, is a second difference, as palpable, as fundamental, as the first. Human ingenuity will assail these positions in vain.

3d. Applying to the Jewish institution the term church, then between it and the church of Christ, there is a fundamental difference as regards their membership. Of the Jewish church, the whole nation were members. Men and women, children and babes, the entire mass of flesh and blood, without any regard to faith or piety. Under that economy the right to membership, and to the privileges of the church, was found in the flesh. The only condition was to be born a Jew, or to be bought with the money of a Jew. But into the church of Jesus Christ, none enter but Christians. Its members are all born again. "Christ loved the church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word." This applies to the whole church. All its members, therefore, are thus sanctified and cleansed. "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." But kingdom of God, is only another expression for church of God. Hence,

none are in that church but those who are born again ; born of water and the Spirit. This is too plain to admit of cavil. Thus the whole theory of infant membership is exploded by a single fact ; for if it could be shown, that in everything else, there is a perfect identity, still as regards this question of membership, the very point in debate, if you please, it is manifest, that there is a most palpable and irreconcilable difference. Truly, the advocates of this practice of infant sprinkling, have a most rugged road to travel. I may now say, with becoming modesty, I think, it is a patent fact, that the Jewish Theocracy, and the church of God, are two distinct and diverse institutions, having points of resemblance, no doubt, but at the same time, points of dissimilarity and divergence as numerous and important, perhaps, as are the differences between any two human governments existing to-day, on the broad face of the whole earth. Such being the case, I ask you, kind reader, to decide, whether an attempt to deduce a warrant for an important religious rite, from their assumed identity, is not absurd and preposterous in the extreme. I do not fear the result of your honest, candid judgment upon the premises now before you. But it will be admitted, that, if a precept for infant baptism cannot be deduced from the argument now examined, then there is nothing in the Bible from which such a precept can be drawn. If the advocates of the rite were invited to select their very strongest argument—the one that they would choose if the whole controversy were made to depend upon a single point—I doubt not the very argument would be selected, which I have just shown to be altogether fallacious and unsatisfactory.

But the attempt is sometimes made to show that the apostles practiced this rite. Now, as it is nowhere in the Bible, said that they did, it is evident, that here too, the argument must rest entirely on implication. The household baptisms mentioned in the Acts of Apostles, furnish the grounds of this argument. Now I cheerfully admit, that the households or families of Lydia, and the Phillipian jailer were baptized. But, is the “inference” of infant baptism from this fact, a “necessary” one? Is there no uncertainty at all as to any material part of the argument? Is it absolutely certain that there was an infant in either one of those families? To prove that there was, is manifestly essential to the argument. This is so plain that a child must see it. And yet, if the salvation of every infant-sprinkling person on earth depended on proving it, the thing could not be done. The argument is so manifestly defective, that to expose it further, were a work of supererogation upon which I do not now feel the least inclination to enter. Enough has been written to accomplish my

purpose in the present article, and I here close the argument on this part of my subject. I cannot, in the limits within which I propose to confine myself, pursue the investigation further. If the strongest arguments rest upon unsupported, and sometimes, demonstrably false assumptions, what shall be thought of the weaker ones? If the very citadel has been stormed and taken possession of, who would trouble himself about weak and unimportant outposts? Such then is infant baptism—an unsupported human tradition—a mere device of men, untaught in, unwarranted by, the word of God. It is as much will-worship, as the invocation of saints or angles, as prayers for the repose of the dead, as extreme unction, or any other glaring and acknowledged innovations upon the faith and worship of the apostolic church. Its existence to the present day is a perpetual memento, sad indeed, but instructive nevertheless, of the frailties of our fallen race. This is my deep, deliberate, honest conviction. Reader, is it not your conviction too?

Specification 2. The Anxious-Seat. This is, no doubt, a quite modern “institution,” and, in this respect differs widely from the one just considered. Infant baptism, in point of antiquity, has a claim to our respect; if, indeed, any age, however venerable, can impart such a claim to an unsanctified human device, that has been unwarrantably, and contrary to the word of God, foisted into the worship of Christians. This appliance, however, which, in harmony with the current style of the orthodox parties, I have called the anxious-seat, is destitute even of that claim upon our respect which attaches to gray hairs. In itself, it does not deserve a serious notice, and would not have been introduced here at all, but, that the true minister of the true gospel of Jesus Christ, owes a duty to God and the world, which cannot be performed without an earnest, persistent remonstrance against every departure from the truth.

It is not necessary that I should enter into any definition or explanation, in order to enable the reader to understand what I mean by the expression, “anxious-seat.” No one that has ever been present at a revival meeting among the sects, during the last twenty-five or thirty years, needs to be told. On all such occasions, it is too prominent a part of the performances to be overlooked. It has acquired all the characteristics of an institution, and in the minds of the untaught and superstitious masses, has come to be regarded almost as a *sine qua non* to conversion. Indeed, the minister himself, has been known on such occasions, to more than insinuate that there was very little hope for him who persistently stayed away. Here, then, the anxiously inquiring are invited to come. Here they strive to get religion. Here

they agonize for conversion. Here they are told to believe, only believe, and they will find the Lord precious to their souls. Here, too, they are taught to pray, that they "may be enabled to believe," as though God heard prayers offered in unbelief. And here while the poor sinner is praying and agonizing for himself according to the instruction of his blind guides, into whose befogged understandings, a single clear conception of the true doctrine of conversion to Christ, has scarcely ever penetrated, the prayers of the church are being exhausted in his behalf. Everything that can be done to fan the flame of excitement, is done. Songs are sung; prayers are vociferated; choruses of "amens" are shouted, until the scene beggars description—and all this in the name of Christianity, outraged Christianity. Alas, for the follies of our race! Shame upon any sensible man, who would be found lending his name, and the weight of his character to such crude, foolish, and unscriptural extravagancies.

The sin of the practice which I am now considering (I speak plainly), consists chiefly in the following particulars: First, the whole thing is without the shadow of a warrant in the word of God, is therefore will-worship, and will-worship, whether so intended or not, is rebellion against the divine government. Did any apostle of Jesus Christ ever designate an anxious-seat? Did ever a scene occur under their administrations, in the least degree akin to those enacted around these anxious-seats in the present time? The answer is, that no apostle ever committed such an indiscretion; that no such scenes ever occurred under their ministrations. The thing has no countenance whatever in the word of God. I need not be told that it is right to pray for sinners, that we are commanded to pray for all men, and that prayer is the chief exercise in this anxious-seat institution. I know we are commanded to pray for all men. My brethren pray for all men, for sinners too, as earnestly and as importunately as others, and yet they have no anxious-seats. The apostles were models of faithfulness in their calling. They not only prayed for sinners, but toiled earnestly and incessantly for their conversion, and yet they had no anxious-seats. Do not tell me that it is a convenient arrangement for the "instruction" of anxious inquirers. The expedient was not gotten up to facilitate instruction. It is not practiced for that purpose now. There is no place less suited to instruction. What! calm reflection, sober thought, amid the surroundings of an anxious-seat? The thing is simply preposterous. No, such a place is not suitable for instruction, and instruction is not the object for which persons are invited to come to it. Its chief and only merit is this: it is a happy expedient to assist a sectarian preacher in working upon the passions of the ignorant

and unstable multitude; it is most eminently fitted to aid a religious demagogue in kindling up the feelings of women and children, and sometimes, men of ardent and inflammable temperaments, into a blaze of excitement. This is its only use. It answers no scriptural purpose—suberves no rational end. If you want to pray to God for sinners, go to your closet and pour out the very depths of your soul into his listening ears. If you pray according to his will, he will be sure to hear you. If you want to throw a ray of light into the mind of some errant, but thoughtful fellow-mortal, who is trying to grope his way in the direction of heaven, invite him into your study, or into your private parlor, or anywhere that he will be most easily induced to open his heart to you, and that you can most effectually inscribe the truth upon the tablets of his soul. The apostles of Jesus Christ were most skillful teachers. They taught the people publicly, and from house to house, without ever once dreaming of a modern anxious-seat as a fit place for instruction.

2d. The anxious-seat system implies a false and pernicious view of conversion. The anxious are invited up "to be prayed for." They are presumed, in the invitation, to be "concerned" about their salvation. They are "anxious" to be saved. Now the question is, why are they not saved? Is it their fault? Or is it God's fault? This system answers in effect, it is God's fault. It seems to be built upon the idea, that the chief thing to be done, is, not to reconcile the sinner to God, but rather to persuade God to be reconciled to him. It implies plainly, that the reason why anxious persons are not Christians, is that God must do something for them, that he has not yet done, that he must exert some power or influence, that he has hitherto withheld. For this, they are taught to pray, and for this, the whole church prays on their behalf. Now, in all this, there is not one word of truth. The thing to be done in conversion, is to persuade sinners to be reconciled to God, and to do, from the heart, what he commands them to do. The Heavenly Father needs no human intercessors to persuade him to be willing to save sinners, or to prevail with him to exert the influence necessary to their salvation. He is much more desirous that sinners should be saved, than are the sinners themselves. The whole scheme of redemption has its foundation in this fact. This system, therefore, mistakes the very nature of the remedial economy, and throws back upon God himself, the blame which attaches to the sinners alone.

3d. It implies a false and unscriptural view of prayer. The Scriptures teach us as plainly as they teach anything, that faith is a pre-requisite to acceptable prayer. But this system sets the sinner to praying for faith, praying that he may be "enabled" to

believe. The Apostle Paul, in his day, taught the people that it was impossible "to call on him in whom they had not believed." But what Paul thought impossible, is easy enough for the wiseacres of our time. A prayer, to be heard in heaven, must be the earnest breathing of a penitent believing heart. To one who has read the Bible aright, there can be no plainer proposition than this. But this anxious-seat system reverses this order entirely, and teaches men to pray *for* faith, while the Bible teaches them that they must pray *in* faith. This is a very grand mistake indeed. Heaven help us all to see our follies!

4th. It makes void the will of God. A word or two here will be sufficient. Anciently, when persons were in the condition, in which these anxious persons are supposed to be, they were told to "repent and be baptized for the remission of sins." This is the divine arrangement. This is precisely what all persons, who have heard the gospel of Jesus Christ, and have been pierced to the heart by it, and are therefore really anxious to be saved, ought to be told to do now. The truth has not changed since then, and none of us should fear to follow in the footsteps of inspired men. But modern sectarians have found out, that baptism for remission of sins is a very dangerous doctrine. They cannot trust the word of God. But whenever a sinner becomes interested about his salvation, they forthwith present themselves with this darling invention of their own, between the sinner and the commandments of Jesus Christ. Surely the Scribes and Pharisees of the Saviour's day, who made void the law of God by their traditions, are most numerous represented in Christendom now.

Specification 3. The admission of persons to baptism, upon what is technically called the relation of an experience. Upon this point I do not wish to be misunderstood, and I am sure that with honest, candid persons, there is no danger that I shall be. No amount of care and pains-taking, however, will save one from the spirit of misrepresentation and slander, that partisan zeal sometimes inspires. Be it understood then, once for all, that, of Christian experience, properly so called, my brethren are not enemies, but steadfast, devoted friends. They believe in it with an undoubting faith, and realize it in their hearts all along the pilgrimage of life. But they have no faith in, nor patience with, the wild vagaries of the imagination, which have sometimes, passed current under that name. It has been their mission to draw the line of separation between the true and the false, the scriptural and the unscriptural. This has been an unpopular work, and in the present generation, has brought upon us a great deal of odium. But the children, and grandchildren, of those who have abused and maligned us, will thank God that the work has been done.

It is not pretended, however, that, in executing this task, no one has ever said indiscreet or foolish things. In the excitement of debate, and stung to the quick by the slanders of those, who felt that in the light of the truth, their power with the people was passing away, it would have required more than human prudence, never to have spoken unadvisedly. But the battle is mainly over now, and the smoke of the conflict is passing away. We can look over the field calmly, and sum up the results dispassionately. There is no longer any excuse for mistakes on our side, nor justification for persistent misrepresentation on the part of our adversaries. Truth only shall abide the ordeal of the great day. Happy he who loves and practices the truth, for in that day, the God of truth will be his friend.

Whatever a man consciously feels, whether in way of suffering or enjoyment, is experience. It is no real objection to this, to say that sometimes our feelings are altogether groundless, for the emotions themselves are real. Experience has to do with that which is subjective exclusively. It has respect to the "inner man" alone. It is impossible, therefore, that its domain should be broader than that of consciousness. I cannot, by experience, know what takes place in the mind of another person. His consciousness alone takes cognizance of that. For the same reason, no experiences of ours can determine what is passing in the divine mind. "For" says the apostle, "what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? Even so the things of God, knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God." A man may know when he believes in Christ, for his faith falls within the limits of his own consciousness. For the same reason, he may know when he repents of his sins, and with a solemn purpose of heart resolve to turn to God. He may know when he confesses the Saviour, and is immersed, for these are overt acts about which he cannot be mistaken. But can he by his consciousness, here on earth, determine the time when God pronounces him pardoned, in heaven? Nonsense! Just as easily could that felon, who languishes in the cell of your state prison, determine by his feelings, the precise moment of time when his pardon is being signed in the executive mansion. Pardon is not a mere feeling, that we should be conscious of it. It is not an emotion of our own hearts, that we should experience it. Just here, all the parties of the day, with very few exceptions, blunder most wretchedly. It is God that pardons us. What we do ourselves we can know. What God does for us, in heaven, he must either directly, or indirectly, tell us, or we can have no assurance of it whatever. Sectarians rest the assurance of pardon upon feeling, and in doing so, disre-

gard, utterly, the very plainest principles of the philosophy of mind. The intelligent disciple builds his confidence alone upon the word of God. The prominence given to blind feeling by the systems in vogue at the present day, has done an immense amount of mischief. It has begotten a thousand vague, dreamy, superstitious notions, in the minds of the masses, that operate as so many barriers to the truth. It has led men to accept as proof of conversion stronger than Holy Writ, a dream, a voice, the words of an old song opportunely occurring to the mind—anything indeed—to which the most visionary imagination could possibly attach the idea of a supernatural impulse. And these things have not been confined to the illiterate vulgar alone. They have been fostered and encouraged by the very fathers of the church, by the very Doctors of Divinity themselves. It is against this state of things, that, in the fear of God, and on behalf of his truth, our most earnest protest has been entered. For this offense, more, perhaps, than any other, we have borne, for a half century nearly, the reproaches and contempt of all the simpletons and bigots in Christendom. Blessed be God, a better day is dawning now.

Reader, did you ever hear a candidate for baptism tell his "experience" to the church? Does your memory reach back thirty or forty years, when the genuine coin was in circulation? Alas! the experiences of the present time do not deserve to be mentioned in connection with such as were common then. These are very degenerate days, and can no more produce a real genuine experience, such as they used to have in those good old times, than they can produce another Bunyan. Steamboats and railroads, or causes more occult, perhaps, have wrought wondrous changes since then. But if ever you were present on such an occasion, you remember it well. I have witnessed many such, and can easily call the entire scene before me now. Here are the aged fathers of the church, their silvery locks falling gracefully behind their temples, occupying the space on one side of the house, nearest to the pulpit, and to the candidate. On the other side, are the elder sisters, the Marys and Marthas, the Lydias and Dorcas of the community. The younger members, male and female, seated somewhat farther off, as not being so deeply learned in mystic lore, occupy appropriate positions, and await with becoming interest for the narration to begin. Besides these, the audience contains a fair proportion of anxious inquirers, as well as many careless, hardened sinners, these with eager curiosity and ill-concealed impatience, those with throbbing hearts and solemn countenances, all alike awaiting the opening of the scene. As I call this vision of other days before me now, many faces

once familiar, but alas! long absent from these mortal shores, appear at my bidding, and take their places in the little assembly. The memory of some of them is very dear indeed. Their sincerity, their humility, their burning zeal, shall never be forgotten. God grant that he who pens these lines, may ever be as sincere, as humble, as steadfast, in his determination to do the will of Heaven, as, in his heart, he believes that they were. But no memories, however sacred, can consecrate error, or transmute it into truth. Blessed truth! God strengthen its friends to spread it among all peoples, and into every land! At length the convert commences his narrative, his voice faltering and feeble at first, but gradually acquiring strength and volume as he proceeds. He begins at a very early period of his life, with his first religious impressions. He tells the circumstances which produced them, how he wore along for a time, and how his feelings gradually passed away. Then he tells how he plunged deeper than ever into sin, and, anon, how he was again aroused to think once more of his soul's salvation. Thus he proceeds, recounting everything that, in any way, connects itself with the religious impressions, of which, from time to time, he has been the subject. If he has had a remarkable dream, he tells that. If he is of an imaginative temperament, and has seen any strange sights, or heard any strange sounds, or what, in such cases, was the same thing, imagines that he has, he dwells upon these. Thus he drags along until he is driven almost to despair. All this time, he anxiously desires to be saved. The fields and groves, through those gloomy days, are the witnesses of his agony, and he weeps bitter burning tears of penitence upon his pillow at night. The constant utterance of his heart has been, Oh, that I knew where I might find him! At length, after weeks, perhaps months, of agony, the Lord Jesus speaks peace to his troubled soul. The burden is lifted from his heart, and he is in an ecstasy of joy. The very fields wear a new aspect. The countenances of his friends beam with a new light. The flowers along his pathway are clothed in brighter hues, and the sweet songsters of the forest send forth notes of hitherto unknown melody.

It is impossible for any one who has never witnessed it, to imagine the interest, which such a relation was wont to excite. Every eye was fixed upon the trembling novice from his commencement to his close. As he grew warm with his theme, as he lived over again those gloomy days, and long sleepless nights, every heart throbbed with intense sympathy. The more tender and susceptible shed tears like rain-drops; while others gave vent to their feelings in sympathizing groans and sobs. What heart, that was not adamant, could refuse to sympathize? Yes, dear young

man, even after the long years that have passed away, I sympathize with you still, I am no stranger to the emotions that heave your honest heart. I once drank those bitter waters too. From my very soul I feel for you. Alas, that the gloomy speculations of visionary enthusiasts should have been preached to you instead of the gospel of Jesus Christ! Alas, that your noble heart should have been so long borne down by that heavy burden, which, but for the traditions and commandments of men, need not have lain upon it a single hour! Blessed be God, that the truth at last begins to shine.

And this compound of truth and falsehood, of sincere humble penitence blended with wild vagaries and absurd superstitions, is Christian experience! And all, who cannot be persuaded to swallow the nauseous draught, are to be denounced as heretics, and handed over to Satan for destruction. Very well: "The Lord knoweth them that are his."

But in all this, there is very little that has the ring of the true metal about it. For the most part, it is mere bogus coin bearing the image and superscription of ignorant and enthusiastic innovators upon the faith and usages of the primitive church. These dreams and visions, sights and sounds, mysterious whisperings and inexplicable impulses—these, and all akin to these—have their origin in sheer fanaticism; fanaticism that may have been pardonable enough in the days of John Bunyan, perhaps, but admits of no justification now. Why should an honest inquirer be groping for days and weeks in darkness, straining his eyes to catch the feeblest gleamings of the light? For no reason beneath the heavens, but the ignorance of those who assume to be "called and sent" of God to teach him. Such a case has no parallel in New Testament conversions. The apostles of Jesus Christ never left an "anxious" person in doubt. These "lingering cases" were wholly unknown in their day. Alas, for a man of imaginative temperament, that falls into the hands of the "called and sent" of our time. He is doomed to a hard struggle at best—perhaps to give up the attempt in despair, or not unlikely, as many have done, to find himself a wanderer in the cold and cheerless regions of atheism. An experience, such as I have attempted feebly to sketch, is itself a tradition; the telling of it to the church, a tradition; the making of it a test of conversion, is a worse tradition still; and, finally, the whole thing is without the shadow of a warrant in the Bible. And the worst feature in the case is, that, like other human traditions, it makes void the law of God. In New Testament times when penitent believers desired to be immersed, they told no "experiences," but simply confessed their faith in Christ. The eunuch said, "see, here is water, what

doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip answered, if thou believest with all thy heart thou mayest. And he said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." This scriptural confession, to many persons, no doubt, seems to be very simple, and greatly wanting in dramatic effect, but it embodies both the will and the wisdom of Jehovah, and it is very dangerous for unsanctified hands to tamper with it. That such was the primitive mode of confessing Christ, does not admit of a doubt. It is as certain, as that the Bible is the book of God, or that the proposition, in which the eunuch embodied his faith, is the truth. No one, that has any respect for his own standing is likely to call this fact in question now. Why then, in the name of all that is sacred and dear to us as Christians, is there not a universal return in this particular, at least, to original ground? Heaven speed the day, when there shall be more confidence in the appointments of God, than in the carnal devices of weak and sinful men!

Here, reader, I close the argument, and leave you to make up your verdict. My aim has been, to teach an important lesson, namely: that all true worship is founded in the *will* of Jehovah; that all else is spurious, false, and delusive; that we only know the will of God as he has embodied it in his commandments; and finally, that to keep these commandments from the heart, is the only safe way to the land of eternal rest. Subordination to the *will* of God is the primal law of the universe. He has written it upon the planet that moves in majesty through the realms of space, and upon the insignificant atom that floats in the breeze of the evening.

It will be a blessed day indeed, when the divine *will* shall be done on earth, as it is done in heaven. That the Good Lord may hasten its coming, is the prayer of every true heart.

DISCIPULUS.

TRACTS FOR SPREADING THE TRUTH.—The great means ordained by Christ for spreading the truth is indisputably the living human voice. To this in point of effectiveness the first rank must be assigned. It can neither be superceded nor excelled. Still, though far inferior to this, it is perfectly legitimate to use other means. Amongst these, well written *Tracts* must be allowed to hold no mean place. We wish, with emphasis we wish our brethren would write them, print them, and *especially circulate them by the million.*

THETA'S REPLY TO CULLAN AND ALPHA.

I HAVE carefully read, and I think fully appreciated all that has been said by these two brethren touching my article on communion, in the December Quarterly. The brotherly tone and bearing, of both, commend them to the high consideration of all who prefer dignified discussion, to unworthy efforts at degenerating an opponent's standing, on account of different sentiments. It would not be right to ask the courteous Editor to burden the pages of the Quarterly with a reply to every point that has been made against my position; and although I feel confident that every such issue could be fairly met, no more space ought to be asked for, than is necessary to refute the more troublesome arguments presented by the reviewers. In this article the main issues made by both can be discussed without replying to each one separately. Still, it may be due to myself, and satisfactory to the reader, to notice a number of minor matters first, and dispose of each in a sentence or two.

1. a. Cullan, especially, seems to think that the question for discussion ought to be stated in this way—shall we hold to the Bible as a guide, or to human opinion? This is not the question before us. It is rather, what does the *Bible teach* as to the moral condition of such men as have not been able to learn the whole truth? I presume he will find no opponent with his statement of the issue.

b. They both seem to understand me as contending that *men* have a right to relax the conditions of salvation. Nearly one fourth of Cullan's essay is a discussion of this strange conception of his. The only question debated is whether *God* ever exercises *his prerogative* in acting above his own law, and relaxes his own conditions in favor of the unfortunate. I showed that he has done so in many cases, and that it would be nothing unusual with him so to treat the unimmersed.

c. It is thought that my views tend to slacken the efforts of sinners in regard to obedience. How God's making allowance for those that *could not know* the truth, can form any excuse for *responsible* sinners, is not easy to understand. Their admissions in regard to some getting to heaven without immersion, will have as much tendency to slacken efforts to do right, as will mine. The reviewers seem never to have discovered that their admission involves all the relaxing that mine does.

d. "If the pious unimmersed are in the church then God has

two modes of induction." Both Cullan and Alpha must admit that the ordained way to *heaven is through the church*, and yet both do admit that some may be in heaven who were not in the church—two ways to heaven. Again Alpha says, "God might have pardoned Luther at or before his death"—without immersion of course—this is one way of pardon. But that the scriptural way is by faith and obedience, they will not deny—another way. This makes for them two ways of pardon, and two ways to heaven. Notwithstanding Alpha admits that some may be pardoned "at or before death," without immersion, on the same page he denies the possibility of pardon, or of having the Holy Spirit, to any such persons. He affirms, however, that God "does relax some of the conditions of entering heaven." Putting these things together, we make out what this relaxing consists in—it is in taking to heaven without remission, without the Holy Spirit, without being a Christian, or ever having communed in their lives. This is allowance-making without stint. Cullan also admits that some may reach heaven without having learned or obeyed but "one or two" of the conditions of entering the church; that is, without immersion. He also, then, is responsible for this neology that teaches admission to heaven without pardon, or pardon without immersion. Instead of sounding an alarm over Theta's comparatively innocent solution of the moral problem involved in this discussion, they ought to be considering whether they are not liable to a charge in "the next ecclesiastical court" of departing from the "plain simple teaching of the word of God."

e. Alpha asks, "for what do I baptize the unimmersed if they are already in the kingdom?" I will also ask one question: For what do you baptize them if they can reach heaven without it? Answer me. If Alpha still insists on my answer coming first: here it is. 1. I baptize them for the answer of a good conscience, that the evidence of their pardon may be based in the word of God, instead of their own unsteady feelings. 2. I baptize them because, though they may have been "counted for circumcision," they have not been properly introduced into the kingdom. 3. I baptize them because, though "an independent act of sovereignty" may have placed them in the kingdom, their disobedience when their duty is known, would soon put them out of it. And, lastly, I baptize them because while God has confined us as preachers, to the regular form of introducing them into the kingdom, he himself may not be obliged to work by squares, triangles, quadrangles, or parallelograms. Can Alpha give as satisfactory reasons for his practice? Alpha admits that Luther lacked "the same fitness for the church as for heaven, neither more nor less."

Of course then the want of immersion *throws no more difficulty in his way at the door of the church than at the gate of heaven.* How strange then, that both Cullan and Alpha should prognosticate the disruption, dissolution, and disintegration of all the "conditions of salvation," simply because Theta contends that God can hold his High Court of Equity in front of the church, as well as in front of heaven.

f. The cases of Uzza, the young prophet of Judah, and King Saul, are all instances of punishment for the violation of *known* laws, and that too, in a dispensation when God was establishing his character among men as a lawgiver. They can therefore have no application here.

g. Alpha thinks "if a man can get into the church without immersion, it is right to go out and preach it; that it is our duty to preach it." This logic is delightful. Why then does he not start out and preach that God may forgive a man "at or before death" without immersion? Or why not go out preaching that men can get to heaven without immersion by virtue of what Cullan calls an "independent act of sovereignty"? If it be true it ought to be preached. Both our reviewers seem to have left their rear unprotected, and not to have suspected that their admissions in regard to God's relaxing his law in the way they suppose, would be more difficult than in the way I presume to affirm.

Finally, The last item to be noticed in this divison is the fact that God has often acted above his own written law, both in granting a blessing, and withholding the punishment where the naked law would not warrant it. Cullan may write as many more pages to prove that David broke no law in eating the show bread, and still it will remain that the Saviour quoted both this circumstance, and that concerning the priests in the temple profaning the Sabbath, to justify the apostles in violating the letter of the law in pulling ears of corn on that day. The Jews had no permission in their law to neglect either circumcision or the passover, but because they could not attend to these ordinances, while traveling in the wilderness, the Lord seems not to have held them responsible for the omission. The laws of nature were suspended or outdone in every instance of a miracle wrought by Jesus Christ, without discounting in the least the value of the regular ordinary action of those laws. So in religion.

2. We now approach the discussion of several subjects requiring an ample development. And first, it is quite common for some of us to deny without ceremony, and sometimes without much study, that God ever accepts *equivalents*. But does the Bible teach it? is the question. It is very easy to keep exhorting us all to stand to the "simple truth," the "plain teachings," &c., but legiti-

mate questions sometimes arise that the *simple plain truths* cannot explain. Addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division will not serve for the solution of problems in the higher mathematics. Yet these are the plain simple teachings of mathematics. This does not imply that John iii: 5, and Mark xvi: 16, are insufficient for those who may know the truth, for they are the power of God to such, but it does imply that these passages cannot settle the question for those for whom "an independent act of sovereignty" is necessary.

It was stated by one of the brethren in the A. C. Review, that God might accept the will for the deed, or the "spirit of obedience," for "obedience," as an *equivalent* in the case of those who could not learn the whole truth. Those who took the opposite view, considered this a dangerous departure from the truth, and fell to exhorting us all to cleave to the "simple truth," without ever examining whether God ever really does accept such an equivalent. Now in what I shall say on this page, I do not profess to cleave to the *simple plain* truth, for we are not investigating a simple plain subject. "The Bible has its shallows where a lamb may wade, and its depths where an elephant may swim." The four rules of arithmetic, just named, cannot solve a problem in algebra, or analytical geometry, and the question we are now discussing cannot be decided but by Scriptures applicable to it; and whoever cannot go beyond the *simple* teaching is not prepared to read this controversy. The question is simply this: Do the Scriptures throw any light upon this inquiry—will God accept the faith, the piety, the purity, the humble prayerfulness, the life long labor for the glory of the cross, as witnessed in such a man as Richard Baxter, who, after all his Bible study, never learned immersion, and own him as his child? Untaught question, says one! Not too hasty, try to hesitate a little just here; perhaps it is not wholly an untaught question. If the Bible teaches that God *ever* accepts equivalents it would not be inconsistent in such a case as this to take the will for the deed where the deed could not be performed.

Here then comes the contest as to Scripture teaching. And as an illustration and proof of the principle; did not God accept Abraham's *faith* as an equivalent for a perfect obedience to law? "Faith was counted to Abraham for righteousness." In Paul's day, did not the Jews fail to attain to righteousness, seeking it by a perfect obedience? and did not the Gentiles attain to righteousness by means of faith? Now a perfect obedience is equivalent to legal righteousness, and faith is equivalent to legal righteousness; and two things equal to the same thing are equal to each other; that is, an active faith in Christ is accepted as an equiva-

lent for a perfect obedience of the law of Moses; and in this way alone "the righteousness of the law (of Moses) is fulfilled in us," faith being a constant work of God.

Again, "Therefore if the uncircumcision keep the righteousness of the law, shall not his uncircumcision *be counted* for circumcision?" Rom. ii: 26. *Uncircumcision counted for circumcision!* How could the uncircumcised keep the righteousness of the law, when circumcision itself, to which they had never submitted, was a part of that law? Now, circumcision, although practiced before Moses wrote the law, was, nevertheless, a part of that law—"Ye on the Sabbath day circumcise a man that the law of Moses be not broken." Here it is plainly stated that the Gentiles kept the *righteousness of that law having entirely failed to obey one of its plainest and most objective commands*. I know this is a riddle to many, and yet it is in the Bible, and we are often told we must "stick to the truth." I have no doubt that John iii: 5, is true, and I have no doubt this passage is also true, and we should have no less regard for the one than for the other, for they are both in the Bible. Whatever struggles may be made to extricate one's self from this difficulty, it still remains that "uncircumcision *was counted* for circumcision"—taken as an equivalent under the circumstances—the will for the deed, the spirit of obedience for obedience.

But what is meant by "keeping the righteousness of the law"? The next verse shall be our commentary—"And shall not uncircumcision which is by nature *if it fulfil the law* judge thee." Then *keeping the righteousness of the law* simply means *fulfilling the law*. What! *fulfil the law* without having obeyed that ordinance which *initiates* a Gentile into the Jewish church! It really seems so. And were such Gentiles members of the Jewish church? Not formally, certainly; but morally and religiously the Lord considered such to be Jews, for "he is not a Jew who is one outwardly, but *he is a Jew* who is one inwardly." That is, those Gentiles who "showed the work of the law written in their hearts," were "counted" as Jews, as the circumcision, although they had not learned the duty of circumcision, and had never obeyed it. Now, if the Lord can so far accept equivalents as to count uncircumcision for circumcision under the circumstances above named, it gives us an insight into the mind of God, and how he will, or may manage cases in the Christian dispensation who, like those Gentiles, long after the knowledge and ways of truth, but never find it all out—their uncircumcision may be *counted* for circumcision. The truths embraced in these passages are not simple plain truths, nor do we profess to be dealing at present with easy truths. We are looking into the deep things of God, for it is right to speak wisdom among them that are perfect. Mr. Baxter was

commonly known in his own circle of intimate acquaintances as, "*Holy Mr. Baxter*," and although he never entered the kingdom according to the legal, regular form thereof, it would be nothing new, nor unusual for God to *count* him as one of his children. I can always commune with those whom God communes with. This would compromise no truth, it would sanction no error, nor relax any command.

3. But Cullan has developed a doctrine that will seem both new and startling to our readers. He takes the ground that both *sprinkling and pouring are to receive the divine sanction at the gate of heaven*. Strange how extremes will meet. Be not alarmed, gentle reader, for Cullan's own language shall make out his new doctrine. On page 290 he says: "If Luther can be saved when he had not been immersed," * * then "not only is immersion as a divinely ordained term of admission to the church relaxed, but sprinkling and pouring receive the divine sanction at the gate of heaven." In this sentence he intended, evidently, to place the probability of Luther's salvation in as hopeless a condition as is the probability that sprinkling and pouring will receive the divine sanction at the gate of heaven. The two stand or fall together. If Luther is saved, sprinkling is indorsed. This being so, it is fair to say that if Luther's prospects should improve, pouring also will rise toward par value. Turn then to page 287 and read—"Truth and candor compel us to say that we *do not know* whether Luther is in heaven or not." Of course, then, he does not, by this time, exactly know whether sprinkling and pouring will be sanctioned or not, for they are following the fortunes of Luther—cannot exactly decide against them, for after he has conscripted all his "truth and candor," he dares not so decide. Now on the same page see the essayist reach the climax—"If Luther was worth saving—a question which we do not dispute—then our Father forgave him his errors." So sure as Luther was worth saving, which is not denied, so sure was he forgiven, and taken to heaven, and so *sure* "sprinkling and pouring receive the divine sanction at the gate of heaven." This is something original. It not only proves the author's faith in the final salvation of some without immersion, but proves that in the end affusion will turn out to be just as valid as the scriptural "mode." What theological seminary will first reward the discoverer with D. D.?

If Cullan does not like this conclusion, then must he retreat from his assertion that the salvation of Luther would necessitate the sanction of sprinkling, or any other error he entertained. But it is not likely that Cullan either will, or can "pursue the advantage that lies behind," for he has involved his logic in difficulty deeper still, proclaiming that to receive unimmersed per-

sons to our communion is to indorse "infant baptism, and all the dogmas and unauthorized practices of Pedobaptists generally." The principle here stated is that communing with one in error indorses the error. Well, brother Cullan will not deny that he has communed with several who hold the views I am now advocating, and of course he indorsed them. And if I have his indorsement I see no use in arguing with him any longer. We had an old father in our Israel who till the day of his death firmly believed in the doctrine of election; we have another prominent minister among us now, who once believed in Universalism, and communed every Sunday with the church and they with him. I know of another old preacher who still believes in feet-washing, and I have often communed with him without doing any of my friend Cullan's "indorsing." I would kindly remind him that we are not to do so much "indorsing" at the Lord's Table, where every man should simply examine himself and "so eat of that bread and drink of that wine."

There seems to be a new current setting in to run our churches into the unenviable attitude of the close communion Baptists. Why follow the "faith and order" Baptists? If Alpha and Cullan could establish their views in our churches, we would soon become as impenetrable as the "Hard Shells" themselves. The Baptists set out determined to commune with none but the immersed, but they soon discovered even this to be too broad a foundation. They must now have the same "faith and order" in other respects besides immersion, and hence, very few of them will commune with the Disciples. What their next refinement will be none can tell. One thing is clear; this closeness will become still more stringent as more light is shed around by others, for a sectarian's mind acts like the pupil of the eye—contracts with an increase of light.

Why is communion at the Lord's Table considered more sacred than other acts of worship? We can sing, pray, preach, &c., with those with whom we will not commune. Why? Who can give us the origin, the history, and the philosophy of this exotic notion? Does the Bible say that communion is a more sacred ordinance than prayer? Has communion any peculiar effect in averaging the aggregate piety of the communicants all around, making the bad man better, and the good man worse? People generally seem to think the object of this ordinance is not so much to remember the Lord's death, as to produce a sort of spiritual equilibrium among the communicants; that is, they all "indorse" for one another. Now Cullan has not given us the origin, nor history of this interloper, but the philosophy thereof he has given: it is expressed in these words—to commune with

the unimmersed is "a practical indorsement of all their errors"—just as the Saviour "indorsed" Judas when he was at the Lord's Table.

4. We will now come steadily up to the master argument by which both Cullan and Alpha have attempted to outflank our position, which, as submitted in the December Quarterly, is substantially as follows: That whereas *some* good men have studied the Bible all their lives, anxious to know the whole will of God, and have even suffered for Jesus' sake, and would doubtless have rejoiced to be immersed, had they known it to be their duty, and yet never found out that truth, and so have never been immersed, God may, in conformity with the known principles of his moral government, accept such as citizens of his kingdom on earth, as being Jews inwardly, taking the will for the deed, and "counting" the spirit of obedience for obedience. To surround this position by numbers our reviewers have enrolled, drafted, and conscripted all their available forces, consisting of all good Quakers, moralists, heathens, idiots, and infants, claiming that if God accepts *some* good men into the church on account of unfortunate circumstances, why not all? This is the argument chiefly relied on by both the writers, to the fair consideration of which we will come by consecutive approaches.

a. There is a moment in the hour of twilight when it may be difficult to say whether said moment is more akin to midday or midnight. But to argue from this that there is no difference between light and darkness would be a little illogical. It has always been difficult to draw the lines between the children of light and of darkness, but this is a poor apology for counting them as one. Cullan places the moralist who has "no faith in the atonement of Christ," but trusts to his own works, on an equality with the humble, believing, prayerful, pure-hearted, John Newton, than whom a holier man has been found in but few centuries since the world began. This is a miscegenation scarcely allowable in the kingdom which we have received. To be in the kingdom of Christ it is necessary for a man to know the will of Christ; if not the entire will, at least so much of it as will put him under God's spiritual control. This cannot be the case with infants, idiots, heathens, moralists, or any other class of human beings who either cannot or will not put themselves under the government of our King. As it is no easy task to decide where human reason ceases and animal instinct begins, or where the irresponsibility of childhood ceases and its responsibility begins, so it would be impossible for one not able to search the hearts, or to know just how much allowance God will make for the unfortunate, to decide upon the precise point at which, in such a one's

religious progress, God may consider him fit to be "*counted*" a child of grace. While I will make no effort at such a discrimination, I cannot but repudiate all that labor-saving classification, that arrays the classes above named all in the same condition, relative to church membership, with the unimmersed man who has read, and prayerfully studied the word of God—believes and obeys all he understands of it—and enjoys ever so humble a hope of salvation by the blood of Christ. The phrase "*some* good men," then, passing the crucibles of both the reviewers, turns out to be a well chosen expression. Socrates, Cicero, and Aristides the just, though good men, could not be considered Christians, never having heard of Christ, and so as to the other classes named. I think, then, I am entitled to the full benefit of the adjective *some*, and am logically responsible only for the class described in our "position."

b. Assuming now that we have to do only with such, we will inquire into the reason for excluding them from Christian fellowship. It must be admitted by every unprejudiced mind, that what are called the orthodox churches, accept far more truth than they reject—that if they were wrong on the hundreds of subjects on which they are now right, and would even get right on baptism and the few other subjects on which they are now wrong, it would instantly convulse the whole Protestant world. For a graphic statement as to the large percentum of truth held as common ground between us and the Presbyterians, the reader is referred to Elder John Rogers' "Review of the Report of the Transylvania Presbytery," in which the writer fills four pages of that finely written pamphlet with a mere catalogue of the Bible truths in which we agree. I refer to this as good authority; for Brother Rogers is not the man to crave the favor of sectarians, or to shrink from a full, bold statement of all the points at issue. They are our only allies in support of the Bible itself against the attacks of its enemies. Now, admitting them to be wrong, of course, in the eight or ten Scripture truths in which we are in advance of them, let us examine the basis of this close communion theory.

c. Cullan and Alpha are willing, no doubt, to commune with Baptists, but not with unimmersed Methodists; the preference being based solely on the immersion of the former. On every subject except the proper subject and action of baptism, the one is as far wrong as the other. And hence, even to commune with Baptists, according to Cullan's own reasoning, you must indorse all their errors—Calvanism, abstract influences of the Spirit in conversion, that baptism is not essential to salvation, that it is not for the remission of sins; you must also indorse their monthly or

quarterly communion, and close communion, even as to the immersed of other churches not of the "same faith and order," besides indorsing their creeds, and mourning-benches. All this must be done in communing with modern Baptists; and yet Cullan and Alpha would prefer the fellowship of such to that of one right in everything but immersion. Again, if they are willing to commune with all immersed believers they would not refuse the fellowship of the Waldenses, or such like. But these both believed in, and practiced *infant baptism*. True, some modern Baptist writers have endeavored to relieve them from this charge, but the evidence against them is too strong to be doubted. Moreover, if the right action of baptism is to overrule every other consideration, they will not refuse the communion of Dunkers, for they are immersed believers. Here, then, is more indorsing for Cullan, for the Dunkers practice trine immersion, and the Editor of the A. C. Review says, trine immersion is valid, for "being immersed three times of course they were immersed once." They also believe in and practice penance, and mortifications of the flesh for sins; teach works of supererogation, celibacy, that the gospel is preached to the dead, that the Jewish Sabbath should still be kept, instead of the Lord's day, foot-washing, the holy kiss, and so on. Now, all these errors are rejected by the Pedobaptists with whom the reviewers will not commune for want of immersion, who upon the whole perhaps have more truth than the long-bearded Dunkers. How much would be gained by accepting these at the Lord's Table in preference to such a man as the unimmersed Charles Wesley, may possibly be enough to build the close communion doctrine upon, but if so, it is because the doctrine itself is so *close* and narrow that it does not need much ground to stand upon. The truth is, no one, immersed or unimmersed, ought to be encouraged to the Lord's Table unless he be either legally introduced into the church, or unless, innocently ignorant of the initiatory ordinance, he be, nevertheless, a Jew inwardly, having the circumcision of the heart, it being decided in Heaven's own Chancery that his uncircumcision *ought in equity* to be counted for circumcision. Such persons can commune and do commune despite of all the disabilities that may be thrown in their way.

Finally, Cullan thinks we have no right to take any "supposed principles of final judgment," and apply them to God's dealings with men in this world. But this one use of those principles of final judgment we have a right to: as God never changes his righteous principles, we know that whatever considerations govern his decisions on that day in cases that cannot be judged by the law, will prevail in every case of equity whether it be here or

hereafter. The "Court of Equity" is said to "proceed upon rules of equity and conscience, to *moderate the rigor* of the common law, and to *give relief in cases where there is no remedy in the common law*."—Webster. The necessity for a Court of Equity does not arise out of imperfections in the laws of God, or men, but out of the circumstances of men in which it would not be right to judge them by the "rigor of the common law." Some men, as many as have sinned in the law, "shall be judged by the law," but God needs a Court of Equity or Chancery for all other cases for whom the "rigor of the law" must be relaxed. Now, the Lord can hold his Chancery in one place as well as another, and can "give relief in cases where there is no remedy in the common law," in front of the church as well as in front of heaven. We have nothing to do in this high Court—no seat there—and yet if there is such a court revealed in the Bible, we have a right to know it. When I simply prove the existence of such a court, how inappropriate for Cullan to reply as if he were called upon to defend the "common law." Who attacked the common law? Does the Court of Equity weaken the sanctions of common law? Cullan seems to think so, for he calls this very principle, page 290, "a conflict of divine authority." He thinks this puts "the law of discipleship in conflict with the law of final judgment." This is true so far as equity is in conflict with common law and no farther. Who ever, before Cullan, discovered that the advocate of equity "breaks down the distinction between elementary truth and error" in the common law? Had Cullan understood the real issue before us, I am sure he would not have used four pages of the Quarterly in fighting a foe of his own creation.

I must reply to another singular specimen of logic. Cullan, strange to say, did not, on reviewing and correcting his manuscript, turn the stylus upon the following sentiment: That if the sprinkled can be considered Christians, then "sprinkling and immersion are equal in their practical value." That is, if God in mercy receive a man into his favor who entertains an error in theory, or practice, or both; then that error the Lord has indorsed and it is equal to a truth. I have often thought some men, and indeed, all Christian men, will be saved *in spite* of their errors, but never by means of them. No man is worth a hundred per cent. either as to his knowledge or practice of religious duty. There is a discount upon every one of us. So there is some alloy in gold and silver coin, but who would say the alloy is what gives it commercial value? or that the alloy is proved to be of "equal value," simply because it is used or handled with gold? Yet Cullan thinks if a person be, even by "an independent act of sovereignty," acknowledged a child of God while he is somewhat

in error, that this at once transmutes the alloy into gold. We do not say that all errors are of equal magnitude, or that a failure to be immersed is a no more serious discount than the ordinary imperfections of a Christian's life; I only intend by this paragraph to let a little light in upon Cullan's new discovery, and untwist his bad logic. We are to teach the whole will of God and raise the per centum of truth in every man's mind and heart up as near to the par value as possible, although at a discount ourselves. Laverrier discovered the last solar planet; Brother Campbell with others, discovered the last religious truths we have learned, but there were both astronomers and Christians before these, thank the Lord. We should keep up separate churches, not because there are no other Christians in the world, but that we may the more successfully individualize our newly discovered truths, and to compel the world to take a step forward. To stand at the head of the Protestant reformation is honor enough without attempting to unchristianize those men of God by whose labors and sufferings for the last three hundred years this summit has been gained.

I would not conceal my opposition and aversion to our churches ever dropping into the rear of the Baptists and following the ill-fortunes of the doctrine of close communion which has always stood in the way of the union and fellowship even of the immersed. This never has been our position, as Prof. Pendleton showed in the Review from the writings of Brother Campbell, and there is but little ground to fear that it ever will be. Its supporters have never advanced their cause by it; it tends rather to indurate the churches and banish from our communion many a soul that enjoys the communion of the Holy Spirit. If we could all learn what this meaneth, "I will have mercy and not sacrifice," perhaps we would not condemn the guiltless unimmersed.

THETA.

WE shall allow Theta's Article three months in which to do its work and rest, before subjecting it to the tender mercies of the dissecting knife. At the expiration of that time, however, we expect to take the life out of it. Meantime, we ask for the article a sound reading. Its tone is fine, and all through it is felt a bounding pulse. Whether this high beat is the effect of disease or the express of real life, we shall let time and chance determine.

IMMERSION IN THE HOLY SPIRIT.

AN article in the last number of the Quarterly entitled "Baptism in one Spirit into one Body," has struck the public mind as quite a novelty in the literature of the Reformation. It is not only novel, but it is contradictory to some conclusions very generally received among us, and upon a subject which the brethren have studied with great diligence. Of this the author was fully conscious, and in anticipation of the reception which awaited his article, very justly remarked that "no view is to be rejected merely because it is new." The lover of truth should never be a dogmatist; nor conclude, that on any subject he has nothing more to learn. But he should stand ready, whenever his conclusions, even those of which he is most confident, are challenged upon the basis of new reasons, to renew his investigation. We say, upon the basis of *new* reasons, because the mere reiteration of old and oft refuted arguments against any proposition can impose no such obligation. The novel conclusion of the article in question is sustained by a course of argument equally novel, and with an ingenuity unsurpassed on the pages of the Quarterly. It demands, therefore, the most careful consideration, and we propose to review it deliberately and thoroughly.

I have for some years been convinced that the immersion in the Holy Spirit is not fully understood, and that it needs investigation and discussion *de novo*. The same may be said of the entire subject of the Holy Spirit and his work in human salvation. Although there are some propositions upon this subject which are well defined, and well settled among us, yet on no other subject are there so many points in which we feel distinctly and painfully the want of certainty. It is a surprising fact, that amid all the myriads of volumes with which the presses of the past century have been teeming, we should have had no masterly and scriptural work on the Holy Spirit. The work of Jenkyn comes nearer meeting the demand than any other; but it is marked by defects which are inseparably connected with Calvinism, and it stands almost alone. Even among our own brethren nothing more has appeared than a few well written essays on special points in the great range of inquiry. The most complete and scriptural exposition of the subject is to be found in the Campbell and Rice debate; but there only a single branch of it comes under review. The range of the discussion upon which we are now entering must be still more limited; but if it should be the means of stim-

ulating inquiry, and, as a final result, of leading some sound student of the Bible to give the world such a volume as we have indicated, it would not be by any means fruitless.

The main issue presented by the article under review is this: was the immersion in the Holy Spirit confined to certain persons who received miraculous gifts, or is it enjoyed by all disciples alike? The latter is the conclusion in which the writer's course of reasoning terminates. A number of reasons are offered in support of this conclusion; but it is unnecessary to refer to them at all, if, as the writer declares, it is *actually asserted*, that we become members of the one body by "being immersed in one Spirit into it." If this be asserted in the passage under consideration, it is not to be questioned, and needs no further proof than this assertion affords. We may say further, that if the author has given us the right rendering and collocation of the words, they certainly contain this assertion: for he would have them read, "*we were all immersed in one Spirit into one body.*" This is not the collocation of the words which he gives in the formal rendering of the verse; but he contends that this expresses the meaning correctly.

Previous to offering this new rendering, and in the very first paragraph of his article, he makes this observation: "The question, how is it that by one Spirit we are all baptized into one body? has, heretofore, caused no little perplexity; and as long as it is put in the words here used, it will never cause less." If he should find that the new rendering proves no less perplexing than the old one, perhaps the latter will grow somewhat in his favor. And really the *perplexity* which the new rendering must cause, is the very first result of it which strikes the mind. If it be true that the immersion by which we get into the one body is immersion in one Spirit, then, instead of coming in by a kind of double immersion, of Spirit in Spirit, and body in water, it will be difficult to prove that the immersion in water is any part of the process whatever. Suppose it were denied that baptism in water brings us into the one body, or has any part in doing so. You answer, Paul says, "as many as have been baptized into Jesus Christ, have put him on," and this language proves that we are baptized into Christ, which is the same as being baptized into the one body. I say, yes, very true; we *are* baptized into Christ, but this is not *water* baptism; it is *Spirit* baptism; for "*we were all immersed in one Spirit into one body.*" You fly to Romans sixth, and quote, "So many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death;" but I again answer that as it is *in one Spirit* that we are baptized into one body; wherever a baptism is mentioned which brings us into Christ or the one body, we are bound to understand it as the baptism in Spirit, unless there are some

qualifying words to give it another reference. Thus, by the admission that it is immersion in the Spirit which brings into one body, I shut you off from every method of proving that immersion in water is a part of the process. If you appeal to the commission as recorded by Matthew, and quote, "baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit," I may still assert, that though the immersion administered by the apostles brought them into the name, it is the immersion in the Spirit which brings them into the one body. When you quote that except a man be born of water and the Spirit he cannot enter the Kingdom of God, I could admit that a birth of water is necessary to entering the organized kingdom; but that the immersion in the Spirit alone brings us into the mystical body of Christ. You might consider this caviling; but you would find it somewhat puzzling; and, with your very best efforts you would fail to show by a direct declaration concerning immersion in water, what I show concerning immersion in the Spirit, that it *brings us into the one body*.

Still further. If it be true that the immersion in the Spirit brings us into the one body, then all proper subjects of this immersion are in the body as soon as the immersion takes place. But Cornelius and his friends were immersed in the Spirit, and therefore into the one body, *before* they were immersed in water. This is still further proof, that on this hypothesis immersion in water has no part in bringing us into the one body.

Again, the apostles on the day of Pentecost are expressly declared to have been immersed in the Holy Spirit. On your hypothesis this immersion brought them into the one body, and previous to it they were not in the body; but their immersion in water took place previously, therefore it was not this that brought them into the body of Christ. Now, is there not something puzzling in these facts? And even if the puzzle could at last be successfully solved, does not the new rendering of this passage in the 12th of 1 Cor. rob us of some of the passages on which we have relied to prove that by immersion in water the penitent believer is brought into Christ and into his death?

But an effort may be made to save some of these passages in their true sense, by the rule of criticism, that when the word immersion occurs unqualified we must understand it in its primary scriptural sense, of immersion in water. Indeed, this effort is made (p. 281) in reference to Paul's statement, "*there is one baptism.*" I meet this effort in two ways. *First*, I propound a rule of interpretation equally imperative, that when it is clearly ascertained that a certain effect is attributed to a certain cause, wherever that effect is mentioned, that cause is implied, unless

there is some limiting expression to indicate another cause. By the application of this rule, as it is positively asserted that immersion in the Spirit brings us into the one body, wherever immersion, unqualified, is mentioned as bringing us into one body, or into Christ or as effecting the same change under other forms of expression, we must understand it as immersion in the Spirit. This rule would hold good, unless it were also explicitly declared that we are *immersed in water into one body*; in which case the term immersion, in such passages as we have supposed, would be ambiguous. But there is no such declaration as this.

Upon this rule, the statement of Paul in Eph. fourth, that there is *one baptism* would bear quite a different meaning from that which the writer gives it. The seven units there enumerated by the apostle are specifications under the exhortation to "keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace;" (see the connection, Eph. iv : 3-6), and the baptism there mentioned must be that one by which "*unity of the Spirit*" is attained, and maintained. Moreover, it stands connected with the "one body," and must therefore be understood as the baptism which brings us into the one body. But the baptism which meets both these demands is that in the Spirit; for "we were all *immersed in one Spirit into one body*:" therefore the *one baptism* of Paul is the baptism in Spirit and not in water.

There is not only something puzzling in all these conclusions, but they show that the establishment of the writer's criticism would completely revolutionize our course of argument in reference to the office of immersion in water. There is no one to whom this would be more repugnant than to the author himself.

But, in the second place, the rule of criticism that the word immersion, when unqualified, must be understood in its primary sense of immersion in water, is strictly correct; and, unfortunately for the rendering and interpretation for which the writer contends, it applies to his text as well as to other passages. When Paul says, in this passage, that "we were all immersed into one body," this rule requires us to understand the term "immersed" of immersion in water, unless it is so limited as to compel us to understand it differently. But the writer assumes that it is so limited here, and locates the expression "*in one Spirit*," immediately after the term "immersed" for the very purpose of thus limiting the meaning of the latter term. But this is certainly a mislocation in fact, if not in meaning. The apostle locates this expression at the beginning of the sentence, so as to read, "In one Spirit we were all immersed into one body." Now, with this arrangement of the proposition, the expression "in one

Spirit," limits the term *we*, instead of the term *immersed*. Assuming that *we* were first in *one Spirit*, it asserts that *we* were *immersed into one body*; and makes the latter event take place subsequent to the former. This suits the Baptist idea that a man must first be in the Spirit, which in New Testament phraseology, is equivalent to having the Spirit in him, Rom. viii: 9, and must afterwards be immersed into the body, which is the church. Indeed, it corresponds precisely to their conception of the case of Cornelius and his friends, who were first in *the one Spirit*, and afterwards *immersed into the one body*. According to Paul's real collocation of his own words, therefore, the term "immersed" in this passage still means immersed in water, and the only difficulty in the case is found in detemining the meaning and proper rendering of ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι.

Before proceeding to grapple with this difficulty, it may be proper to start the inquiry, may it not, after all, be true, that one or the other of the conclusions to which the writer's rendering seems to drive us, is the correct conclusion?

First. Is it not true, that we are brought into the one body by immersion in the Spirit? If so, it is certainly not proved by the passage we have been considering; for, as we have just seen, this passage, even with the rendering in question, contains an entirely different proposition. Again, by the rule which requires the term immersion, when not otherwise limited, to be understood as immersion in water, it is certain that in the latter sense, we are immersed into Jesus Christ, and into his death. This is the one immersion which brings us in the unity of the Spirit into the one body. Moreover, it is certain that neither of the two immersions in the Holy Spirit which are expressly so styled in the Scriptures brought its subjects into the one body. The apostles constituted a part of the body of Christ before they were immersed in the Spirit; and Cornelius and his friends were immersed into the one body, born out of water into the kingdom, *after* they had been immersed in the Spirit. Now, how is it possible for us to maintain that all are brought into the one body by immersion in the Spirit, in face of the fact that this is not true of the only persons who were unquestionably so immersed? Even if we had an express declaration that immersion in the Spirit brings us into one body, we would find extreme difficulty, if not an impossibility, in attempting to reconcile it with these facts.

Second. Is not the Baptist hypothesis the true one—that we are all first in the one Spirit, and afterwards, by immersion in water, brought into the one body? If so, we must find the historical facts upon the subject in harmony with this idea. But we find the apostles all in the one body *before* they were immersed in

the Spirit; and we find the twelve disciples in Ephesus immersed by Paul "into the name of the Lord Jesus," (Acts xix: 5-6), *after* which Paul laid hands on them, and they received the Holy Spirit. And lest these should be considered anomalous cases, it was some days, if not weeks, after the Samaritans had been immersed by Philip, that the Holy Spirit came upon them in answer to the prayer of Peter and John: "for as yet he was fallen upon none of them, only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." Acts viii: 14-17. In all these cases the Baptist idea is reversed; and so it appeared to Paul and Peter in reference to all other cases; for Paul says: "Because you are sons, God has sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father;" (Gal. iv: 6), and Peter commands, "Repent and be immersed for the remission of sins, *and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.*" Acts ii: 38.

We now proceed to the inquiry, what is the real meaning of the expression, ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι? rendered by the writer, *in one Spirit*, and in the common version, *by one Spirit*. That ἐν means *in*, and must be so rendered when there is nothing to rule otherwise, cannot be denied. And that ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι, standing alone, should be rendered *in one Spirit*, is equally undeniable. But ἐν is sometimes rendered *by*, and must be so, when either the context, or the harmony of Scripture statement requires it. If we were to consult the context alone, there would be found nothing in either the grammatical or logical structure of the sentence to forbid the use of *in*. But we have already seen that other facts and statements in the New Testament forbid the idea expressed by the rendering, "*in one Spirit we were all immersed into one body.*" This alone is sufficient ground for inquiring whether there is any other admissible rendering which will better harmonize with other unambiguous passages. If the laws of the language admit another rendering, we are compelled to seek it; and if New Testament usage furnish any other in similar connections, we are invited to adopt it.

Now it so happens that there are just three forms in which the agency of the Holy Spirit is expressed by πνεῦμα in conjunction with a preposition. These three are *δια* with the genitive, *ὕπο* with the genitive, and *ἐν* with the dative. Of these three, all of which are rendered *by* or *through* the Spirit, the last occurs *most frequently*; so that the very expression under discussion, which the writer so unhesitatingly renders *in one Spirit*, is the Greek form most frequently rendered *by the Spirit*, and used in declaring that something is done by the Spirit as an agent or actor. That it is correctly thus rendered, will be apparent upon examination of a few of these passages. We find no less than *four* occurrences of this

usage in the very chapter which contains the text in dispute, and in the immediate context. We read in the third verse, "No man speaking *ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ* *by the Spirit of God*, calls Jesus accursed; and no man is able to say that Jesus is the Lord, but *ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ* *by the Holy Spirit*." In neither of these cases can we render it *in* the Spirit, because it is evidently the purpose of the writer to express an agency of the Spirit; and because men can say that Jesus is Lord *by* the Spirit, though they be not themselves *in* the Spirit. It was *by* the Spirit as the source of all evidence, and not *in* the Spirit, that men were able to believe in and acknowledge the Lordship of Jesus; and when a man called Jesus accursed, it was proof not merely that he was not *in* the Spirit, but that he did not speak *by* the light which the Spirit afforded through his divine testimony.

Again, in the ninth verse we read, "To another is given faith *ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ πνεύματι* *by the same Spirit*; to another the gift of healing *ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ πνεύματι* *by the same Spirit*." Now, the parties on whom these gifts were conferred were all *in* the Spirit; but these gifts were conferred *by* the Spirit, and this is what the apostle here affirms. In the ten verses of this chapter, from the third to the thirteenth, there are twelve things said to be done *by* the Spirit, and *ἐν πνεύματι* is the prevailing expression, only varied for the sake of euphony by *διὰ πνεύματος* once, *κὰτὰ πνεῦμα* once, and leaving *ἐν πνεύματι*, to be understood throughout the tenth verse.

As this criticism constitutes a capital point in this inquiry, I will be excused for accumulating evidence upon evidence in its favor. The two forms *ὕπὸ πνεύματος* and *ἐν πνεύματι*, are used in the same sense by Matthew and Luke in describing the same event. Each says that Jesus was "*led by the Spirit* into the wilderness," (Mat. iv : 1, Lu. iv : 1), Matthew using the former expression, and Luke the latter. Peter and Paul do the same thing. In declaring that the prophets of old spake "as they were moved *by* the Holy Spirit," Peter uses *ὕπὸ* with the genitive; while Paul, in speaking of the mystery which was not made known to other generations, "as it was revealed to his holy apostles and prophets *by the Spirit*," uses *ἐν* with the dative. (Comp. Pe. i : 21 with Eph. iii : 5.) In view of all this evidence, we hold it is undeniable that the expression *ἐν πνεύματι* is frequently used by the apostles in expressing what is done *by* the Spirit, and that it may be rendered *by the Spirit* wherever it is more suitable either to the context, or to the nature of the subject under discussion in a particular passage.

I think it may now be affirmed that we have established three propositions : *First*, That to render the passage in question, "we were all immersed *in* one Spirit into one body," would be a mislocation of the apostle's words, and untrue in fact. *Second*,

That it would be equally untrue to render it, "in one Spirit we were all immersed into one body;" meaning thereby, that we were first in the Spirit, and afterwards immersed into the body.

Third, That the passage may be rendered, so far as grammatical propriety is concerned, "by one Spirit we were all immersed into one body." This last rendering being entirely consistent with New Testament usage, and the only alternative if the first two are rejected, we shall be compelled to adopt it provided it yields a sense in harmony with the context and with other known facts upon the same subject. This is now to be tested.

The writer objects to this rendering, and the meaning it yields, for several reasons which he does not "consume space to state," and for one which he does state. He says, "The long and not very smooth ellipsis which it requires us to supply lies strongly against it." Now, it would be very acceptable to us if the ideas of the apostles were always expressed in such a way as to avoid an ellipsis; but certainly the necessity of supplying an ellipsis is no very serious objection to a certain rendering, provided, the passage is so worded as to readily suggest that ellipsis. But, after all, is there any ellipsis in the passage? It states that "By one Spirit we were all immersed into one body." The sense is as complete as when it is said we are saved "by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Spirit." It may, and does, require the supply of a number of words in each of these cases, to show *how* these things are so; but these additional words constitute an *explanation*, and not the supply of an *ellipsis*. The writer supplies what he styles the ellipsis, in these words: "By the teaching of the one Spirit through the apostles, we have all been induced to submit to the one baptism in water, and by that act have all become united to and are therefore component members of the one body." I confess that if this were an ellipsis, it would be a frightfully long one, and as awkward and unsightly as it is long. But the writer, in the hurry of a closing paragraph, has obviously miscalled an *explanation* by the name of an *ellipsis*; and even as an *explanation*, I fear he has thrown it into the contortions which disfigure it rather for the purpose of making it look ugly. Having a more affectionate regard for it, myself, I can smooth its features, and dress it up more handsomely in this style: By one Spirit, as the divine agent moving us thereto, we were all immersed into one body; I declare, that to my eye, this looks very smooth, and it is certainly not very long. It looks, indeed, very much like some of its kindred in the same chapter: for when it is said (verse 3), that "no man speaking by the Spirit of God calls Jesus accursed, and no man is able to say that Jesus is Lord but by the Holy Spirit," the same explanation

is needed. It is not by the Holy Spirit as actually inspiring every believer, but by the Holy Spirit as the source of all divine evidence of the Lordship of Jesus. When it is said that we must be "*born of the Spirit*," a similar explanation is needed, but there is no ellipsis.

But we have another passage which presents a still more striking parallel to the one in question. It is 1 Cor. vi: 11; where Paul says, "you were washed, you were sanctified, you were justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus, and *ἐν πνεύματι* *by the Spirit* of our God." Now, they were not washed in the Spirit, neither were they sanctified or justified in the Spirit of God. But these were all done *by* the Holy Spirit in the name of Jesus. Neither of them, however, was done *directly* by the Spirit. The act of justifying is the prerogative of the Father; and the Spirit can be said to justify only as he leads us to comply with the conditions of justification. Sanctification is the work of the Spirit, but it is accomplished *through the truth*. As for the washing here mentioned, it evidently refers to the effect of baptism, in which they "*washed away* their sins calling on the name of the Lord." In what sense had this been done "*by the Spirit of our God*"? Evidently, in the same sense in which Paul says in the same Epistle that, "*by one Spirit* we were all immersed into one body." It was done, in one sense, by themselves; for they obeyed the gospel in immersion. It was done in another sense, by Paul, and Timothy, and Apollos; for they had been immersed by those men. But in still another sense, it was done by the Holy Spirit; for he both directed the administrator in commanding and performing the immersion, and also influenced the subject to submit to it. By the Holy Spirit, therefore, strictly and properly, the Corinthians had been *washed*, and by the same Spirit, in the same act, they had been immersed into one body.

I can but regard it as a serious defect in the article, that the writer did not state more fully his objections to this rendering, and the meaning which it so obviously expresses; and especially, as he must have known that it is the only rendering at all likely to prevail against his own. I attribute this, however, to a fact quite apparent throughout his article, that he had no great confidence in the correctness of his own position, but threw it before the brotherhood rather with the expectation, if not, indeed, the hope, that it would be thoroughly refuted. It is not his way of arguing a question when he is confident that he stands upon unassailable ground.

In the absence of formally stated objections, I can only revert to such as suggest themselves to my own mind. After what I have said concerning the grammatical issue involved, I can think

of only one objection likely to strike the mind of a candid reader, which is this—that it appears far-fetched in the apostle, when referring to the person by whom they had been immersed into the one body, to say that it was by the Spirit, instead of saying that it was by Paul, and Timothy, and Apollos, and others, by whom they had actually been led into the water. But this objection is at once set aside, when we remember the purpose for which the whole statement was introduced. The purpose of the whole context was to establish the identity of that one Spirit by whom all spiritual manifestations were effected. He starts the proposition, in the fourth verse, that there are “diversities of gifts, but the *same Spirit*.” He then specifies: “To one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom, to another the word of knowledge by the *same Spirit*; to another *faith* by the *same Spirit*.” Other gifts are specified, and he adds, “But all these work that *one and self-same Spirit*, dividing to each one severally as he will.” Lest it should appear strange to us that he should so earnestly insist upon a proposition which none of us ever doubted, we must remember that to the Corinthians this subject of spiritual manifestations was entirely new, and there were two obvious sources from which they might imbibe the error that Paul is here so earnestly combating. In the first place, the inability of the human mind to comprehend how the same Spirit could speak at the same moment, on a thousand different topics through a thousand different and widely separated individuals, would naturally suggest that these manifestations were the work of a multiplicity of spirits. Again, when they observed that one inspired man had only the gift of tongues, and could not work other miracles, whilst another could work miracles but could not speak in tongues; that one had the gift of healing, but could not prophesy, whilst another could prophesy, but could not heal, it was difficult to avoid the conclusion that they were different spirits, and of different kinds of supernatural power. That this error did actually prevail in the church is rendered certain by Paul’s formal attempt to eradicate it. His course of argument consists in showing them that all these diversities of gifts were wrought by one and the same Spirit, distributing to the brethren, as he severally chose, limited and various degrees of his own supernatural power. And finally, in order that they all, both those who had gifts, and those who had not, might know still more definitely what Spirit this was, he tells them it was the same Spirit by whose direction and influence they had all been immersed into one body. Thus we see that the course of his argument most naturally and logically brought him to mention the Holy Spirit in connection with that ordinance by which they had become one body.

We may further remark, here, that the mention of the Holy Spirit in this connection must have had a more vivid effect upon the minds of these brethren, than it can have upon ours. For they recollected that when Paul came among them preaching Christ, he accompanied the word with "demonstrations of the Spirit, and of power," and claimed that he spoke "not in the words which man's wisdom teaches, but which the Holy Spirit teaches." The whole of this, too, was for the express purpose, that their faith might not rest "in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God." 1 Cor. ii: 1-13. The Holy Spirit was a visible working power and authority in their presence, and it was with most explicit reference to him that the Corinthians, "hearing, believed and were immersed." Acts xviii: 8. When therefore, Paul refers to the fact that it was "by one Spirit," they had all been immersed into one body, they could be at no loss to understand his meaning. The only reason why our minds do not as readily catch the same thought, is because the Holy Spirit did not exhibit himself, when influencing us, in the same startling "signs and wonders, and diverse miracles" in which he appeared to them. This shows the importance of transferring ourselves to the exact position of parties addressed in the Scriptures, if we would understand allusions which are made to their condition or past history.

That the interpretation of the passage in question which we have now given is the correct one, is confirmed by evidence in the passage itself. That the last clause of the verse, "and were all made to drink into one Spirit," refers to the reception of the Holy Spirit, I would say is indisputable, had it not been disputed by most of the Commentators.—See Bloomfield *in loco*. They refer it to drinking the wine in the Lord's Supper—a reference quite foreign to the subject of the context, and having nothing to suggest it or justify it except the word *drink*. But the drinking in that institution is drinking the blood of the Lord Jesus; not drinking the Holy Spirit. The term *drink* certainly expresses the idea of receiving within us what is drunk; and when used of the Holy Spirit it is scarcely possible that it does not refer to the reception of the Spirit within us. Why the term *drink* should be used in the connection, I would rather account for from the refreshing effects of receiving the Spirit, like a draft of cool water to a man parched with thirst; than by the writer's conceit that it was suggested by the accident of drinking some water when one is immersed.

If we are right in thus understanding the last clause of the sentence; we are right in our interpretation of the first clause. For after saying that "we were all *immersed in one Spirit* into one

body," it would be but a useless repetition to add, "and we were all made to drink into one Spirit." The reception of the Spirit is the fact affirmed in the last clause, and it is presented as something additional to what was said in the first; but if the reception of the Spirit is declared in the first, the last is not an additional fact, but a repetition. We conclude, therefore, that the first clause does not refer to the reception of the Spirit at all. On the contrary, it declares that it was by the Holy Spirit that we were induced to be immersed and become one body; while the last clause declares the additional fact that we all then became partakers of the refreshing influence of the Spirit as a guest within us.

We now dismiss the consideration of this passage; fully persuaded that the common version of it, and the meaning of it as commonly understood among our brethren are correct. With a few paragraphs upon the universality of immersion in the Spirit, we will bring our article to a close.

There seem to me but two methods by which it can be proved that all Christians are immersed in the Holy Spirit; *First*, by producing a declaration of Scriptures to that effect. *Second*, by proving that what is called immersion in the Holy Spirit, is identical with something said to take place with all Christians. The writer attempts the proof upon both of these methods. His main reliance under the first method, is upon the passage which we have just dismissed, and which fails to sustain him. He also makes use of a declaration or prophesy uttered by John the Immerser: "He shall immerse you in the Holy Spirit." He says of this prophesy, "To limit the word *you* in this passage to such persons only as were miraculously endowed, seems to me to be a most unwarrantable restriction." Now, this remark would undoubtedly be correct, if we were compelled to look at John's words alone. But when we are permitted to see a prophesy and its fulfillment both at the same glance, we are not at liberty to interpret one without some reference to the other. The fulfillment, indeed, is often the only key to a proper interpretation of the prophesy. When this prophesy began to be fulfilled on the day of Pentecost, there were one hundred and twenty disciples in Jerusalem, but it is certain that only the twelve apostles were then immersed in the Holy Spirit. This would require us to limit it forever to them unless we find it extended to others. Consequently, the reader of Acts naturally goes forward from the second chapter, under the impression that it is so restricted, until he is surprised, in the tenth chapter, as all the apostles were, to find the same gift bestowed on Cornelius and his friends. Acts xi: 15. This is sufficient proof, that whether the restriction is authorized or not, John's words do not establish the universality of immersion in

the Spirit. The writer himself admits that his argument upon these words is not decisive.

We may further observe, that John's prophesy may be, for aught that yet appears, one of those in which the prophet looked to all the wide flowing consequences of the event predicted, and swelled his words beyond their literal fulfillment, to take in this whole area. For it is true that though the immersion in the Holy Spirit may have been confined, as respects the Jews, to the apostles, and as respects the Gentiles, to Cornelius and his friends, yet from this beginning all the good effects of it were spread abroad to all believers, whether Jew or Gentile, bond or free. Such prophesies, like that to Abraham, that all the families of the earth should be blessed in him, must always await their fulfillment for the correct adjustment of their limitations.

Under the second method of proof which we have designated, the writer presents one argument which involves the whole question. He says: "If the soul of the inspired man is literally immersed in the Spirit which dwells in him, why not as well the soul of the uninspired be literally immersed in the Spirit, which dwells in him?" The argument involved in this question is an attempt to prove the universality of immersion in the Spirit by showing that that which takes place in us all by the indwelling of the Spirit is the same thing that is called an immersion in the case of those who were immersed in the Spirit. If this can be clearly shown the attempt must prove successful. But to establish the identity of two effects, each must be unmistakably and clearly defined. This he well knew, and he has therefore attempted a definition of immersion in the Spirit. He says correctly that it pertains to the soul; and that it is a literal immersion of the human spirit in the Holy Spirit. It was during his debate with Mr. Caples, in the fall of 1860, that this position was first advanced in public discussion, after being thoroughly canvassed in private conference; and I recollect distinctly how it thrilled the vast concourse of brethren who were present, like a sudden emission of new light from heaven; while it astounded Mr. Caples and his friends so completely that nothing more was said about proving *pouring* from the baptism of the Holy Spirit.

This definition is undoubtedly correct. But an immersion of the human spirit in the Holy Spirit necessarily implies a *contact* between the two; and the contact of Spirit with spirit is not contact in its physical sense; but implies vital action of the one Spirit upon the faculties of the other. Such vital action must be contemplated as the chief part of the immersion; otherwise, it would be like the immersion of an inanimate block of wood in some inanimate liquid. The promise of immersion in the Spirit

would have been a very empty promise, if it meant nothing more than the envelopment of one spirit in another, like the envelopment of a globule of floating gas in the surrounding atmosphere. The Saviour promised more than this, and there was more than this in the fulfillment of the promise; for when he immersed them in the Holy Spirit he brought about an action of that Spirit both upon their memories and their perceptive faculties. Their memories were quickened and rendered infallibly correct; and their perceptive faculties were lifted to the immediate perception of divine truth.

The writer denies that miraculous endowment was a part of the immersion, and distinguishes it as the work of the Spirit, while the immersion was the work of Jesus. He says it is positively false that the baptism and the endowment are identical; and that it can never be shown that the endowment is an invariable indication of the baptism. There is truth in this distinction; but it is truth which is still consistent with what we have said above. To make this appear, we have only to discriminate more closely in reference to what constitutes miraculous endowment, as distinguished from immersion in Spirit. Now to speak in tongues, to heal the sick, to prophesy, and to do any miracle is an endowment conferred by the Holy Spirit. These of course are distinguished from the *immersion* in the Holy Spirit. But before the Spirit conferred these powers, and in order to conferring them, he was placed in immediate contact with the human spirit, so that the latter became energized by the former. In order to justify calling it an immersion, this divine energizing must have pervaded at least the entire intellectual nature of the human spirit; for it is the intellect that we find directly affected. To separate this from the immersion is to take away from it all vitality, and reduce it, as we have said above, to a mere material immersion like that of one inanimate thing in another. We conclude, therefore, that whilst the power to work miracles, both physical and intellectual, was an endowment conferred by the Holy Spirit, the direct inspiration of the human soul was an essential part of its immersion in the Holy Spirit. This being the case, no one is immersed in the Holy Spirit in whom this inspiration does not take place. But Christians in general, whatever may be said of direct operations on their *hearts*, certainly are not subjects of an immediate impact of the Holy Spirit upon their *intellects*; therefore, Christians in general, are not immersed in the Holy Spirit.

We may reach the same conclusion by another course of argument. There are two events which in the Scriptures are called immersions in the Holy Spirit. There are certain other events

similar to these two, which are not called immersions in the Holy Spirit. If, upon examination, we find these two classes of events precisely alike, then the fact that one of them is styled an immersion in the Spirit would justify us in applying the same term to the other. But if, upon examination, there is a marked difference between the two classes, it would be unwarrantable to thus extend the appellation; for no one could know but that this difference constituted the very reason, in the divine mind, why one was called an immersion in the Spirit, and the other was not. Now, upon examination we do find a very great distinction between what is styled immersion in the Spirit, and the indwelling of the Spirit common to all Christians—no less distinction than that in the former the intellectual powers of the subjects were completely pervaded and possessed by the Holy Spirit, while in the latter there was nothing of this kind. It is, therefore, *unscriptural* to call the latter immersion in the Spirit.

These two cases of immersion in the Spirit, are still farther distinguished from all other cases of inspiration or miraculous endowment. In all other cases, unless it be that of the Apostle Paul, of which we have no information, the Holy Spirit entered persons in answer to the prayers of apostles, and in connection with the imposition of their hands. In these two, it came upon them direct from Jesus Christ, the administrator of the immersion in the Holy Spirit. The fact, therefore, that these two were ministered by Christ, and all others by the apostles, does constitute a material difference between the two; and this difference may be the reason why the latter are not called *immersions* in the Spirit. It would, therefore, be an unwarrantable extension of Scripture phraseology, and would involve the obliteration of distinctions maintained in the word of God, to say that even those brethren who received miraculous gifts by imposition of hands, were immersed in the Holy Spirit.

We have now discussed the salient points in the article before us, and though there are some minor matters mentioned in it of a speculative character, to which we have decided objections, we here dismiss it. We do so with our confidence not at all shaken, but rather strengthened, in the correctness of the views to which the brethren have been accustomed upon this subject. The truth can never suffer by the most thorough and sifting discussion; it must always gain by it. Error alone is afraid of objections, or becomes irritated when they are presented. Truth smiles at the opportunity of more thoroughly vindicating itself, and enters every conflict with calm and hopeful confidence. Let us, then, have all the objections which any man can offer against anything we teach, and let us consider them candidly. KAPPA.

[From the *British Millennial Harbinger*.]

THE BAPTISTS—WHERE ARE THEY GOING?

A NEIGHBORING Baptist minister reports an old deacon, close at hand, as saying that "the Baptists are going to the Independents, the Independents to the Church, the Church to the Romanists, and the Romanists to the —." But we need not repeat all that the old man said. Still, where are the Baptists going, and what are they doing? is a fair question. They seem to be "doing nothing," or what is worse, "doing the things they ought not to do, and leaving undone the things they ought to do," and unless they repent they may have to add, "and there is no health in us." There are individuals and churches honorable exceptions, but present results, as reported by themselves, indicate a state most lamentable. Some act as though a better class of chapels is to be "the power of God unto salvation." Costly buildings with towering spires looking down on the more humble steeple-house of the State Church, are possessed by some, and longed for by others. Fashion-worshipping congregations sustain the cause and support ministers who are charming preachers, with only one defect—their hearers remain unconverted. This is the state of the case in some places, and will be in others so soon as the aspirants can climb the mount. Baptism, too, is sadly in the way. Baptist churches cannot, while they surround the communion table with water, compete with Independents in the race for popularity, and therefore "don't say anything about baptized believers in your trust deed," says one preacher. "Do not form a Baptist Association, but let us merge into the general body of Christians," exclaims a second. Another says, "I rejoice to say that the church which to-day we dedicate to God, is to be open to all Christians—that here the Lord's people of whatever denomination may come to his table." Oh, most charming liberality! most excellent charity! Surely these Baptists convert their tens of thousands. Let us see. The Annual Meeting of the Baptist Union, recently held in London, supplies both facts and comments. From the Secretary's report we learn that an increased number of churches have given in their adhesion to the Union, but that membership in the denomination has only increased, on the average, little more than one member to each church. With this agrees the Baptist Hand-book, where are found the statistics of 1863, and from which it appears that there were 37 associations, containing 1270 churches, which together counted 136,825 members, and gave

an average membership of 122 to each church. The clear increase of members during 1863 is set down at 1825, or about 1½ to each church. The present report shews no alteration in this rate of increase. The returns are from 1701 churches, with a total membership of 176,232 persons, which reduces the average membership to 104, and 1½ the increase of each church. There are many churches not belonging to the associations. The number of Baptists in Great Britain may be 300,000.

The Rev. C. Williams read a paper on Associations, shewing that the Baptists at present are an unorganized body. Of 48 churches in Bedfordshire, 33 are unassociated, and so in other counties. There are 170 churches within twelve miles of St. Paul's, 166 of which do not carry out the connectional principle. In Lancashire there are twelve towns, with populations ranging from 5,000 upwards, in which Baptists are entirely unrepresented. In Yorkshire there are thirteen similar towns in which there are not Baptist chapels. In England there are seventy such towns, with an aggregate population of 754,000. London is almost as bad—Shoreditch, with a population of 77,800, has but one Baptist chapel, and Bethnal-green, with over 100,000, has but four, the united membership of which is 450 only. Mr. Williams urged the great need of associations, in order that combined effort might cover the vacant ground. The Rev. W. Robinson did not concur. "There is no association where he lives. There had been a small one but it had died out, and it was now in contemplation to form a new one. The point is, shall it be a Baptist or a Christian association—should they extend its limits sufficiently wide to embrace all who believe in the Lord Jesus, or should they make it strictly a denominational interest? What might be the result he did not know." By all means we would have the Baptist associations become Christian. But can Mr. Robinson, New Testament in hand, shew that an association of unbaptized persons, or one in this particular mixed, is Christian? Can he shew that unbaptized persons were ever in the Christian church? If he can, let him take the work in hand, and ever after we will help to break up close communion churches. But what would the proposed amalgamation do for Baptists? Push them to the wall, and make them fewer than they are. There are Robinsons in America as well as here. In Tract Societies and Sunday School Unions, and the like, they have united with the unbaptized sects, and with what result? Loss! decided loss! The effects have recently roused some sleeping Baptists on the other side of the Atlantic, and a new series of tracts are now issuing. The first of the series (a letter to Baptists) indicates its main object by a suitable motto—*"God does not allow us to part with one inch of his ground, though we*

might thereby gain the peaceful possession of all the rest." It points out that the circulation of Baptist tracts by Baptists is the exception, and it opposes the co-operation of Baptists and Pedobaptists in what are called "Christian Unions," because such co-operations subverts institutions which Christ has ordained as part and parcel of the Christian system. Facts are added in illustration—"At one of the noon prayer meetings in Philadelphia, Rev. Mr. Catden, an Episcopal clergyman, proposed '*a union communion service.*' Coming from a '*Churchman,*' it was considered a happy move in the right direction. Dr. Brantly, however, a Baptist preacher present, arose to object, and was proceeding to give his reasons, when he was called to order on the ground that no controversy was allowed in the meeting. Thus the Baptists in the meeting were tied up to an arrangement by which they could offer no objections to miscellaneous communion. They had no business there professing a union which was not real." Another incident of a similar character is stated as follows: "In a small town in New Jersey, it was decided to hold union meetings. The *Baptist meeting-house* was selected for the purpose. The meetings were held, and converts to the various *isms* represented in the motly group were added daily. The meetings came to a close, and *not one* was found who desired to be buried by baptism into the Saviour's death. That Baptist church learned a good lesson—that when they yield a part of the truth, the remainder will be stolen from them."

"In 'Sunday School operations' the Baptists have sacrificed truth by uniting with Pedobaptists. The *Union* books ignore everything that is peculiar to Baptists, and when Baptists act as agents or colporteurs for the S. S. Union, they have to seal their lips on the whole subject of baptism. At a Sunday School Convention of the New York Baptist Association a committee was appointed to prepare an 'Address to Baptists on Sunday School Instruction,' having in view the organization of a Baptist Sunday School Union. Only *one* Baptist paper published the address. *All but one* of the Baptist Sunday Schools in New York city were then '*in the hands and under the control of other religious bodies.*'

"A lady connected with a Baptist church in this city had been instrumental in bringing seventy-five persons to a *knowledge of the truth*; but on inquiry it was found that she was engaged in distributing for the American Tract Society, and that the seventy-five had *all united with Pedobaptists churches.* A tract has been put in circulation recently headed, '*How to become a Christian.*' But let the Baptists who have been distributing it in this city and elsewhere say if it teaches the trembling penitent to 'believe and be baptized,' as Jesus taught—or 'repent and be baptized in the

name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins,' as Peter taught—or 'Why tarriest thou? arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord,' as Saul was taught."

But it is not all dark. Sterling things were said at the meeting of the Baptist Union. Caution and rebuke were administered. Rev. J. P. Mursell, of Leicester, read a lesson on *Æstheticism*—"Are we in no danger of falling into the gross notion—of drinking in the too common, but very subtle feeling, that human artifice commends itself to the Divine complacency? that material grandeur comports with the spiritual essence? that garnished temples are pleasing to God? May we not go on till the forms of our worship overlay its spirit, till screens and vestments, intonations, and chants, become substitutes, instead of auxiliaries, to the intelligent devotion of the sanctuary? Is there no danger of the sword of the Spirit losing its edge while brandished amid so much that is incidental and artistic'?"

In the right direction, Friend Mursell! But only half-way. There can be no reasonable objection to a good meeting-house, with every really useful addition, but what need have Christians for screens and peculiar vestments? Let us be content with such clerical robes as sufficed for the apostles, and, when we speak of screens, remember the blanket meetings of the persecuted Baptists of former generations. Perhaps, however, the best things were said by the Rev. B. W. Noel: "It is a very secondary consequence that our chapels rise and are full, that we are esteemed and beloved, if souls are not added to the Redeemer. If souls are not saved, woe to us * *. Now let me ask you—In those churches where not more than one is added in the course of a year, are we believers fulfilling our glory? Can you say that of a church where no souls are saved? Where are the children of our godly parents? More than one in each church would be added if only the children were converted. * *. Were Christ's friends the aristocracy? Did he dine with the Pharisees, except when they wanted to cavil with him? By the poor Christ shook the world. Let us thank God that we have to labor amongst the poor. They are accessible and grateful; and the faith and love of poor men, who are Christians, is often much stronger than that of merchants and gentlemen. Have you ever seen religion work its way downwards? I never did. Get a number of poor men to love Christ, and serve him, and those above will be sure to notice the phenomenon; whereas if you set squires and rich men to worship God, in their fashion, the poor do not notice."

Mr. Noel also gave an earnest call to the churches, not to leave the work to ministers, citing an instance in which a poor man preached the gospel, and in a short time brought fifty souls to

Christ, who, learning that they should be baptized sought not the use of a Baptist chapel, but, with their own hands, dug a baptism in their little hired room. He also urged to plain faithful preaching—"We must preach the gospel, not controversy. When Jesus went about the country, what did he preach? 'Repent and believe the gospel!' What did John preach? What did the Apostle Peter preach? 'Repent and be baptized every one of you, for the remission of sins!'"

Mr. Noel is perfectly right. The gospel will work *upward*, from the poor. The rich will have but little of it—they will have a form of religion without the power and the chapels prepared for them, at a cost far beyond all needed expenditure, will but bar the millions from hearing the word. Let the Baptists in this particular run a race with the Independents and they are lost to real gospel usefulness and open to contempt. Let time-serving preachers, who fail to distinguish between saving sinners and pleasing well-paying seatholders, take heed. The Lord will hold them to account, and a fearful one it will be. On the other hand let faithful brethren, who contend for the good old ways and who may sometimes feel discouraged as they witness costly temples arise in their locality, remember that those erections are but conducive to weakness. Let these brethren compare the last year's results of their own labors with those of the Baptists generally, and they will find room to praise God for a more excellent way and for far superior, if not for fully satisfactory results. They will at least see enough to shew that they are in the right way and have ground for much hopefulness.

THE MILLENNIUM.—During the last year we have spoken frequently on this subject. The views presented have struck the brethren as new and entitled to further and serious consideration. We have, consequently, been often requested to write them out, and present them, in a permanent form, to the readers of the Quarterly. In some number of the second volume, and it may be in the first, we hope to be able to comply with this request. The theme is one of grandest interest; and if, as many seem to think, the excited pulse of the passing moment indicates its near approach, of which we affirm nothing, then should we know whatever of it is to be known. It makes us wild to pen the thought that earth's sorrows may even possibly be near an end. Almighty Father, can it be so? would that we could hope it; and that that were no delusive hope!

CLOSE OF FIRST VOLUME.

THE present number closes the first volume of the Quarterly. We take deep pleasure in presenting, on its final page, our profound thanks to a merciful Father, who has kept and sustained us through the year, and brought us to so happy a termination of its labors. Our only regret is, that our humble work is not more worthy of his approving smiles.

Of the contents of the volume we shall not speak. They are now in the hands of a discriminating brotherhood, who will, we trust, make the disposition of them which they merit. We wish these contents were better; still we are glad they are not worse. We have aimed to speak in the fear of God and for the good of his cause. Our conscience is, hence, clear.

Of the circulation of the work we certainly speak with regret. It has not been what we hoped it would be; and yet we think our expectations were not extravagant. We hoped that our subscription list would count, by the end of the year, three thousand names; yet it now lacks thirteen hundred of that number. How shall we account for this? Our brethren are now subscribing as numerously for papers as at any former period in our history; and, as far as heard from, they have spoken in warm and most complimentary terms of the Quarterly. Why, then, has its circulation not been greater? We believe the reason to be simply this: the brethren have taken for granted that the work would succeed. Hence they have not worked for it, as we believe they otherwise would have done. But the year is now gone, and regrets are idle.

Will you, then, brethren, work for the Quarterly next year? With the present subscription list it cannot be sustained. That list you can double with almost no exertion on your part. Let me confide in you to make the effort. In hope, I ask every saint into whose hands this number may come, to obtain and forward as large a list of subscribers as he possibly can. *Do this at once.*

Of the first volume thirteen hundred are left on hand. Will not brethren who take the second volume, also, order the first, till they have exhausted this remaining stock. Its value is not affected by age, and many, we hope, will want it from the beginning. Four dollars will procure the work for the last year and for the next.

To the noble brethren who have enriched the pages of the Quarterly with their gratuitous contributions, I hereby tender my heart-warm thanks. Were it in my power, their labors should be acknowledged in a more substantial way.



